arXiv:math/0611426v1 [math.AP] 14 Nov 2006

The Cauchy Problem for Wave Equations with non Lipschitz Coefficients

Ferruccio Colombini [*]and Guy Métivier [†]

February 2, 2008

Abstract

In this paper we study the Cauchy problem for second order strictly hyperbolic operators of the form

$$Lu := \sum_{j,k=0}^{n} \partial_{y_j}\big(a_{j,k}\partial_{y_k} u\big) + \sum_{j=0}^{n}\{b_j \partial_{y_j} u + \partial_{y_j}(c_j u)\} + du = f,$$

when the coefficients of the principal part are not Lipschitz continuous, but only "Log-Lipschitz" with respect to all the variables. This class of equation is invariant under changes of variables and therefore suitable for a local analysis. In particular, we show local existence, local uniqueness and finite speed of propagation for the noncharacteristic Cauchy problem.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 The global in space problem **5**

2.1 Giving sense to the Cauchy problem 6

2.2 The main results 9

---

[*] Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Pisa, Largo B. Pontecorvo 5, 56127 Pisa, Italia. Email : Colombini@dm.unipi.it

[†] MAB, Université de Bordeaux I, 33405 Talence cedex, France. Email : Guy.Metivier@math.u-bordeaux.fr

3 Paradifferential calculus with LL coefficients 11
3.1 The Paley-Littlewood analysis 11
3.2 Paraproducts 13
3.3 Positivity estimates 18
3.4 The time dependent case 19

4 Proof of the main results 23
4.1 The main estimate 23
4.2 Estimating v 25
4.3 Estimating $\nabla_x u$ 29
4.4 A-priori estimates for the solutions of (4.11) 34
4.5 Proof of Theorem 4.1 36
4.6 Existence and uniqueness 39

5 Local results 41
5.1 Local existence 41
5.2 Local uniqueness 41

1 Introduction

In this paper we study the well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for second order strictly hyperbolic equations whose coefficients are not Lipschitz continuous:

$$Lu := \sum_{j,k=0}^{n} \partial_{y_j}\big(a_{j,k}\partial_{y_k}u\big) + \sum_{j=0}^{n}\{b_j\partial_{y_j}u + \partial_{y_j}(c_ju)\} + du = f. \tag{1.1}$$

This question has already been studied in the case that the second order part has the special form, in coordinates $y = (t, x)$:

$$\partial_t^2 - \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \partial_{x_j}\big(a_{j,k}\partial_{x_k}u\big) \tag{1.2}$$

and the Cauchy data are given on the space-like hyperplane $\{t = 0\}$. In this case, when the coefficients depend only on the time variable t, F. Colombini, E. De Giorgi and S. Spagnolo ([4]) have proved that the Cauchy problem is in general ill-posed in C^∞ when the coefficients are only Hölder continuous of order $\alpha < 1$, but is well-posed in appropriate Gevrey spaces. This has been extended to the case where the coefficients are Hölder in time and Gevrey in x ([12, 7]). Moreover, it is also proved in [4] that the Cauchy problem is well posed in C^∞ when the coefficients, which depend only on time, are "Log-Lischitz" (in short LL) : recall that a function a of variables y is said to be LL on a domain Ω if there is a constant C such that

$$|a(y) - a(y')| \leq C|y - y'| \Big(1 + \big|\mathrm{Log}|y - y'|\big|\Big) \tag{1.3}$$

for all y and y' in Ω. In [4], it is proved that for LL coefficients depending only on t and for initial data in the Sobolev spaces $H^s \times H^{s-1}$, the solution satisfies

$$u(t, \cdot) \in H^{s-\lambda t}, \quad \partial_t u(t, \cdot) \in H^{s-1-\lambda t} \tag{1.4}$$

with λ depending only on the LL norms of the coefficients and the constants of hyperbolicity. In particular, there is a loss of smoothness as time evolves and this loss does occur in general when the coefficients are not Lipschitz continuous, and is sharp, as shown in [2].

The analysis of the C^∞ well-posedness has been extended by F. Colombini and N. Lerner ([5]) to the case of equations, still with principal part (1.2), whose coefficients also depend on the space variables x. They show that the Cauchy problem is well-posed if the coefficients are LL in time and C^∞ in x. They also study the problem under the natural assumption of isotropic LL smoothness in (t, x). In this case one has to multiply LL functions with distributions in H^s. This is well defined only when $|s| < 1$. Therefore, one considers initial data in $H^s \times H^{s-1}$ with $0 < s < 1$, noticing that further smoothness would not help. Next, the loss of smoothness (1.4) forces us to limit t to an interval where $0 < s - \lambda t$, yielding only local in time existence theorems. We also refer to [5] for further discussions on the sharpness of LL smoothness.

However, the local uniqueness of the Cauchy problem and the finite speed of propagation for local solutions are not proved in [5]. The main goal of this paper is to address these questions. Classical methods such as convexification, leads one to consider general equations (1.1) with LL coefficients in all variables. However, the meaning of the Cauchy problem for such equations is not completely obvious: as mentionned above, the maximal expected smoothness of the solutions is H^s with $s < 1$ and their traces on the initial manifold are not immediately defined. More importantly, in the general theory of smooth operators, the traces are defined using partial regularity results in the normal direction; in our case, the limited smoothness of the coefficients is a source of difficulties. It turns out that when $s \leq \frac{1}{2}$, one cannot in general define the traces of all the first order derivatives of u, but only the Neumann trace relative to the operator, which we now introduce.

Consider a smooth hypersurface Σ and, near a point $\underline{y} \in \Sigma$, a vector field conormal to Σ, $\nu_\Sigma \in T^*_\Sigma$, with $\nu_\Sigma(\underline{y}) \neq 0$. Denoting by η the frequency variables dual to y, define the vector field X_Σ with symbol

$$X_\Sigma(y, \eta) = g_2(y; \eta, \nu_\sigma(y)) \tag{1.5}$$

where $g_2(y; \cdot, \cdot)$ is the quadratic form defined by the principal part of L.

Assumption 1.1. *L is a second order operator of the form* (1.1) *on a neighborhood Ω of $\underline{y}$, with coefficients $a_{j,k} \in LL(\Omega)$, b_j and c_j in $C^\alpha(\Omega)$, for some $\alpha \in]\frac{1}{2}, 1[$ and $d \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Σ is a smooth hypersurface through $\underline{y}$ and L is strictly hyperbolic in the direction conormal to Σ.*

Shrinking Ω if necessary, we assume that Σ is defined by the equation $\{\varphi = 0\}$ with φ smooth and $d\varphi \neq 0$. We consider the one-sided Cauchy problem, say on the component $\Omega_+ = \Omega \cap \{\varphi > 0\}$. As usual, we say that $u \in H^s_{loc}(\Omega \cap \{\varphi \geq 0\})$, if for any relatively compact open subset Ω_1 of Ω, the restriction of u to $\Omega_1 \cap \{\varphi > 0\}$ belongs to $H^s(\Omega \cap \{\varphi > 0\})$.

Lemma 1.2. *i) For all $s \in]\alpha - 1, \alpha[$ and $u \in H^s_{loc}(\Omega \cap \{\varphi \geq 0\})$, all the terms entering in the defintion of L are well defined as distributions in $H^{s-2}_{loc}(\Omega \cap \{\varphi \geq 0\})$.*

ii) If $u \in H^s_{loc}(\Omega \cap \{\varphi \geq 0\})$ and $Lu \in L^2_{loc}(\Omega \cap \{\varphi \geq 0\})$, then the traces $u_{|\Sigma}$ and $(X_\Sigma u)_{|\Sigma}$ are well defined in $H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}_{loc}(\Sigma \cap \Omega)$ and $H^{s-\frac{3}{2}}_{loc}(\Sigma \cap \Omega)$, respectively.

With this Lemma, the Cauchy problem with source term in L^2 and solution in H^s, $s > 1 - \alpha$, makes sense.

Theorem 1.3 (Local existence). *Consider $s > 1 - \alpha$ and a neigborhood ω of $\underline{y}$ in Σ. Then there are $s' \in]1 - \alpha, \alpha[$ and a neighborhood Ω' of $\underline{y}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{1+n}$ such that for all Cauchy data (u_0, u_1) in $H^s(\omega) \times H^{s-1}(\omega)$ near $\underline{y}$ and all $f \in L^2(\Omega' \cap \{\varphi > 0\})$ the Cauchy problem*

$$Lu = f, \quad u_{|\Sigma} = u_0, \quad (X_\Sigma u)_{|\Sigma} = u_1, \tag{1.6}$$

has a solution $u \in H^{s'}(\Omega' \cap \{\varphi > 0\})$.

Theorem 1.4 (Local uniqueness). *If $s > 1 - \alpha$ and $u \in H^s(\Omega \cap \{\varphi > 0\})$ satisfies*

$$Lu = 0, \quad u_{|\Sigma} = 0, \quad (X_\Sigma u)_{|\Sigma} = 0, \tag{1.7}$$

then $u = 0$ on a neighborhood of $\underline{y}$ in $\Omega \cap \{\varphi \geq 0\}$.

Remark 1.5. If the coefficients of the first order term L_1 (see (2.3)) are also LL, the statements above are true with $\alpha = 1$ since the coefficients are then C^α for all $\alpha < 1$. If the b_j are C^α and the c_j are $C^{\tilde{\alpha}}$, the conditions are $1 - \tilde{\alpha} < \alpha$ and the limitation on s is $1 - \tilde{\alpha} < s$.

Remark 1.6. Theorem 1.4 implies that if u is in H^s and satisfies $Lu = 0$ near $\underline{y}$ and if u vanishes on $\{\varphi < 0\}$, then u vanishes on a neighborhood of $\underline{y}$ (see Section 5.2). Moreover, this local propagation of zero across any space-like manifold implies finite speed of propagation by classical arguments which we do not repeat here. In particular, if $\Omega' \cap \{\varphi \geq 0\}$ is contained in the domain of dependence of ω, there is existence and uniqueness for the Cauchy problem (1.6) in $\Omega' \cap \{\varphi \geq 0\}$.

The proof of these results is given in Section 5 below. Because all the hypotheses are invariant under smooth changes of coordinates, we can assume that in the coordinates $y = (t, x)$, the initial surface is $\{t = 0\}$, and in these coordinates, we prove the existence and uniqueness theorems. We deduce them from similar results on strips $]0, T[\times \mathbb{R}^n$ and there, the main part of the work is to prove good energy estimates for (weak) solutions. In this framework, the results of Theorem 1.3 are improved, by using non isotropic spaces, and by making a detailed account of the loss of spatial smoothness as time evolves, as in [4, 5]. The precise results are stated in section 2 below and are proved in section 4 using the paradifferential calculus of J.-M. Bony, whose LL-version is presented in section 3.

2 The global in space problem

In this section we denote by (t, x) the space-time variables. On $\Omega = [0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ consider a second order hyperbolic differential operator

$$Lu = L_2 u + L_1 u + du \tag{2.1}$$

with

$$L_2 = \partial_t a_0 \partial_t + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\partial_t a_j \partial_{x_j} + \partial_{x_j} a_j \partial_t) - \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \partial_{x_j} a_{j,k} \partial_{x_k}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$L_1 = b_0 \partial_t + \partial_t c_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (b_j \partial_{x_j} + \partial_{x_j} c_j). \tag{2.3}$$

The coefficients satisfy on $\Omega = [0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n$

$$a_{j,k} = a_{k,j}, \quad a_0,\ a_j,\ a_{j,k} \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap LL(\Omega), \tag{2.4}$$

$$b_0,\ c_0,\ b_j,\ c_j \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap C^\alpha(\Omega), \tag{2.5}$$

$$d \in L^\infty(\Omega), \tag{2.6}$$

for some $\alpha \in]\frac{1}{2}, 1[$. Recall that the space LL is defined by (1.3), the semi norm $\|a\|_{LL}$ being the best constant C in (1.3). In addition, for $\alpha \in]0, 1[$, C^α denotes the usual Hölder space, equipped with the norm

$$\|a\|_{C^\alpha} = \|a\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{y \neq y'} \frac{|a(y) - a(y')|}{|y - y'|^\alpha}. \tag{2.7}$$

When $\alpha = 1$, this defines the norm $\|a\|_{Lip}$ in the space of Lipschitz functions.

We assume that L is hyperbolic in the direction dt, which means that there are $\delta_0 > 0$ and δ_1 such that for all $(t, x, \xi) \in [0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$

$$a_0(t, x) \geq \delta_0, \qquad \sum_{1 \leq j,k \leq n} (a_{j,k} + \frac{a_j a_k}{a_0}) \xi_j \xi_k \geq \delta_1 |\xi|^2. \tag{2.8}$$

We denote by A_{L^∞}, A_{LL} and B constants such that for all indices

$$\|a_0, a_j, a_{j,k}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq A_{L^\infty}, \qquad \|a_0, a_j, a_{j,k}\|_{LL(\Omega)} \leq A_{LL}, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\|b_0, c_0, b_j, c_j\|_{C^\alpha(\Omega)} \leq B, \qquad \|d\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq B. \tag{2.10}$$

2.1 Giving sense to the Cauchy problem

Consider the vector fields

$$X = a_0 \partial_t + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j \partial_{x_j} = a_0 Y. \tag{2.11}$$

Formal computations immediately show that the second order part of L can be written

$$L_2 u = Y^* X u - \tilde{L}_2 u \tag{2.12}$$

with

$$Y^* v = \partial_t v + \sum_{j=1}^n \partial_{x_j}(\tilde{a}_j v), \qquad \tilde{L}_2 u = \sum_{j,k=1}^n \partial_{x_j}\big(\tilde{a}_{j,k} \partial_{x_k} u\big), \tag{2.13}$$

$\tilde a_{j,k} = a_{j,k} + a_j a_k / a_0$, and $\tilde a_j = a_j / a_0$. Consequently, it follows that

$$Lu = (Y^* + \tilde b_0)(X + c_0)u - \tilde L_2 u + \tilde L_1 u + \tilde d u \tag{2.14}$$

with

$$\tilde L_1 u = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \tilde b_j \partial_{x_j} u + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \partial_{x_j}(\tilde c_j u) \tag{2.15}$$

and

$$\tilde b_0 = b_0 / a_0, \quad \tilde b_j = b_j - \tilde b_0 a_j, \quad \tilde c_j = c_j - \tilde a_j c_0, \quad \tilde d = d - c_0 \tilde c_0.$$

The next lemma shows that these identities are rigourous under minimal smoothness assumption on u.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that* $u \in H^\rho(]0,T[) \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ *for some* $\rho \in]1-\alpha, \alpha[$. *Then* cu, Xu *and* $L_1 u$ *belong to* $H^{\rho-1}(]0,T[) \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. *Moreover* $L_2 u$ *is well defined as a distribution in* $H^{\rho-2}(]0,T[\times\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. u and its space-time derivatives $(\partial_t u, \partial_{x_j} u)$ belong to $H^{\rho-1}$. Following [5], their multiplication by a bounded LL function belong to the same space (see also Corollary 3.6). This shows that all the individual terms present in the definition of Xu belong to $H^{\rho-1}$ and those occurring in $L_2 u$ and $Y^* X u$ are well defined in $H^{\rho-2}$ in the sense of distributions.

Next we recall that the multiplication $(b, u) \mapsto bu$ is continuous from $C^\alpha \times H^s$ to H^s when $|s| < \alpha$. This implies that the terms $b\partial u$ and $\partial(cu)$ that occur in $L_1 u$ and $\tilde L_1 u$ belong to $H^{\rho-1}$ since $\rho \in]1-\alpha, \alpha[$.

The last term du is in L^2, thus in $H^{\rho-1}$, since $c \in L^\infty$ and $u \in L^2$.

The identity (2.12) is straighforward from (2.2) since all the algebraic computations make sense by the preceding remarks. $\square$

Next we need partial regularity results in time, showing that the traces of u and Xu at $t = 0$ are well defined, as distributions, for solutions of $Lu = f$. This is based on the remark that this equation is equivalent to the system

$$\begin{cases} Y^* v + \tilde b_0 v = \tilde L_2 u - \tilde L_1 u - \tilde d u + f, \\ Yu + \tilde c_0 u = v / a_0 \end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

with $\tilde c_0 = c_0 / a_0$. The important remark is that, for this system, the coefficients of ∂_t, both for u and v, are equal to 1, thus smooth. Using the notation $Y = \partial_t + \widetilde Y$, $Y^* = \partial_t + \widetilde Y^*$, the system reads

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v = -\tilde Y^* v - \tilde b_0 v - \tilde L_2 u - \tilde L_1 u - \tilde d u + f, \\ \partial_t u = -\tilde Y u + v / a_0. \end{cases} \tag{2.17}$$

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that* $\rho \in]1-\alpha,\alpha[$ *and* $u \in H^{\rho}(]0,T[\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ *is such that* $Lu \in L^1([0,T];H^{\rho-1}(\mathbb{R}^n))$. *Then* $u \in L^2([0,T];H^{\rho}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ *and* $\partial_t u \in L^2([0,T];H^{\rho-1}(\mathbb{R}^n))$. *Therefore,* $u \in C^0([0,T];H^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Moreover, $Xu \in L^2([0,T];H^{\rho-1}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ *and* $Xu \in C^0([0,T];H^{\rho-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

In particular, the traces $u_{|t=0}$ *and* $Xu_{|t=0}$ *are well defined in* $H^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *and* $H^{\rho-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$*, respectively.*

Proof. **a)** We use the spaces $H^{s,s'}$ of Hörmander ([6], chapter 2), which are defined on $\mathbb{R}^{1+n}$ as the spaces of temperate distributions such that their Fourier transform $\hat{u}$ satisfies $(1+\tau^2+|\xi|^2)^{s/2}(1+|\xi|^2)^{s'/2}\hat{u} \in L^2$. The spaces on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n$ are defined by restriction. In particular, $H^{0,s'}([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n) = L^2([0,T];H^{s'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Recall that ∂_{x_j} maps $H^{s,s'}$ to $H^{s,s'-1}$ and that

$$u \in H^{s,s'},\ \partial_t u \in H^{s,s'-1} \quad \Rightarrow \quad u \in H^{s+1,s'-1}. \tag{2.18}$$

b) For $u \in H^{\rho}$, the first derivatives of u, $\tilde{d}u$, as well as $\tilde{L}_1 u$, Xu and v belong to $H^{\rho-1} = H^{\rho-1,0}$, as well as their multiplication by a LL or C^{α} coefficient. Thus $\tilde{L}_2 u$ and $\tilde{Y}^* v$ belong to $H^{\rho-1,-1}$ and

$$\partial_t v = f + g, \quad f = Lu \in L^1(]0,T[;H^{\rho-1}),\ g \in H^{\rho-1,-1}. \tag{2.19}$$

Let

$$v_0(t) = \int_0^t f(t')dt' \in C^0(H^{\rho-1}).$$

In particular, $v \in L^2(]0,T[;H^{\rho-1}) = H^{0,\rho-1} \subset H^{\rho-1,0}$, since $\rho-1 \leq 0$. Thus, $v - v_0 \in H^{\rho-1,0}$ and $\partial_t(v-v_0) = g \in H^{\rho-1,-1}$. By (2.18) $v - v_0 \in H^{\rho,-1} \subset H^{0,\rho-1}$ since $\rho \geq 0$.

Next, reasoning for fixed time and then taking L^2 norms we note that the multiplication by a LL or C^{α} function maps $L^2(]0,T[;H^{\rho-1}) = H^{0,\rho-1}$ into itself. Thus, by the second equation of (2.17), $\partial_t u = -\tilde{Y}u + v/a_0 \in H^{0,\rho-1}$. This finishes the proof of the first part of the lemma.

c) In particular, it implies that $v = Xu + b_0 u \in H^{0,\rho-1}$. Thus, $\tilde{Y}^* v$ and $\tilde{L}_2 u$ which involve multiplication by C^{α} or LL function, followed by a spatial derivative, belong to $H^{0,\rho-2}$. Therefore, the equation $g \in H^{0,\rho-2}$. Thus applying (2.18) to $v - v_0 \in H^{0,\rho-1}$ implies that $v - v_0 \in H^{1,\rho-2} \subset C^0([0,T];H^{\rho-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Since $|\rho-\frac{1}{2}| < \alpha$ and $u \in C^0([0,T];H^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n))$, the product $\tilde{b}_0 u$ belongs to $C^0([0,T];H^{\rho-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Since v_0 is also in this space, we conclude that $Xu \in C^0([0,T];H^{\rho-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n))$. □

Remark 2.3. If $\rho > \frac{1}{2}$, then the multiplication by LL functions maps $H^{\rho-\frac{3}{2}}$ into itself and we can conclude that $\partial_t u \in C^0([0,T]; H^{\rho-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n))$, as well as all the first derivatives of u, so that their traces at $t=0$ are well defined. When $\rho \leq \frac{1}{2}$, the continuity of $\partial_t u$ is not clear. However, note that the trace of Xu has an intrinsic meaning, as X is the Neumann derivative on the initial surface $\{t=0\}$ relative to L (see the definition (1.5)).

Lemma 2.2 allows us to consider the Cauchy problem

$$Lu = f, \quad u_{|t=0} = u_0, \quad Xu_{|t=0} = u_1, \tag{2.20}$$

when $f \in \bigcup_{\rho > -\alpha} L^1([0,T]; H^\rho(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and $u \in \bigcup_{\rho > 1-\alpha} H^\rho(]0,T[\times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

2.2 The main results

We first state uniqueness for the Cauchy problem:

Theorem 2.4. *If* $u \in \bigcup_{\rho>1-\alpha} H^\rho(]0,T[\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ *satisfies*

$$Lu = 0, \quad u_{|t=0} = 0, \quad Xu_{|t=0} = 0 \tag{2.21}$$

then $u = 0$.

As in [4, 5], we prove existence of solutions in Sobolev spaces having orders decreasing in time. The proper definition is given as follows. The operators

$$|D| \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda := \mathrm{Log}(2 + |D|) \tag{2.22}$$

are defined by Fourier transform, associated to the Fourier multipliers $|\xi|$ and $\mathrm{Log}(2+|\xi|)$ respectively.

Definition 2.5. *i)* $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *or* H^s *denotes the usual Sobolev space on* $\mathbb{R}^n$. $H^{s+\frac{1}{2}log}$ *and* $H^{s-\frac{1}{2}log}$ *denote the spaces* $\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}H^s$ *and* $\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}H^s$ *respectively.*

ii) Given parameters σ *and* λ, *we denote by* $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma,\lambda}(T)$ *the space of functions* u *such that for all* $t_0 \in [0,T]$, $u \in C^0([0,t_0], H^{\sigma-\lambda t_0})$.

iii) $\mathcal{H}_{\sigma\pm\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$ *denotes the spaces of functions* u *on* $[0,T]$ *with values in the space of temperate distributions in* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *such that*

$$(1+|D|)^{\sigma-\lambda t}\Lambda^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}u(t,\cdot) \in L^2([0,T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)). \tag{2.23}$$

iv) $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,\lambda}(T)$ *denotes the space of functions* u *on* $[0,T]$ *with values in the space of temperate distributions in* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *such that*

$$(1+|D|)^{\sigma-\lambda t}u(t,\cdot) \in L^1([0,T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)). \tag{2.24}$$

$\mathcal{C}_{\sigma,\lambda}(T)$ is equipped with the norm

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|u(t)\|_{H^{\sigma-\lambda t}}. \tag{2.25}$$

The norms in $\mathcal{H}_{\sigma\pm\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,\lambda}(T)$ are given by (2.23) and (2.24). Equivalently, $\mathcal{H}_{\sigma\pm\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,\lambda}(T)$ are the completions of $C_0^\infty([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ for the norms

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\sigma\pm\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)} = \Big(\int_0^T \|u(t)\|^2_{H^{\sigma-\lambda t\pm\frac{1}{2}log}} dt\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.26}$$

and

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma,\lambda}(T)} = \int_0^T \|u(t)\|_{H^{\sigma-\lambda t}} dt. \tag{2.27}$$

Theorem 2.6. *Fix $\theta < \theta_1$ in $]1-\alpha,\alpha[$. Then there are $\lambda > 0$ and $K > 0$, which depend only on the constants A_{L^∞}, A_{LL}, B, δ_0, δ_1, θ and θ_1, given by* (2.8), (2.9) *and* (2.10) *such that for*

$$T = \min\{T_0, \frac{\theta_1-\theta}{\lambda}\} \tag{2.28}$$

$u_0 \in H^{1-\theta}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $u_1 \in H^{-\theta}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $f = f_1 + f_2$ with $f_1 \in \mathcal{L}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ and $f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_{-\theta-\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$, the Cauchy problem (2.20), *has a unique solution $u \in \mathcal{C}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T)\cap\mathcal{H}_{1-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$ with $\partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)\cap\mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$. Moreover, it satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{0\le t'\le t} \|u(t')\|^2_{H^{1-\theta-\lambda t'}} + \sup_{0\le t'\le t} \|\partial_t u(t')\|^2_{H^{-\theta-\lambda t'}} \\
&+ \int_0^t \Big(\|u(t')\|^2_{H^{1-\theta-\lambda t'+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \|\partial_t u(t')\|^2_{H^{-\theta-\lambda t'+\frac{1}{2}log}}\Big) dt' \\
&\le K\Big\{\|u_0\|^2_{H^{1-\theta}} + \|u_1\|^2_{H^{-\theta}} \\
&+ \Big(\int_0^t \|f_1(t')\|_{H^{-\theta-\lambda t'}} dt'\Big)^2 + \int_0^t \|f_2(t')\|^2_{H^{-\theta-\lambda t'-\frac{1}{2}log}} dt'\Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

Note that for $t \in [0,T]$, $1-\theta-\lambda t \ge 1-\theta_1 > 1-\alpha$, so that $f \in L^1([0,T];H^{-\theta_2})$ with $\theta_1 < \theta_2 < \alpha$. Similarly, $u \in L^2([0,T];H^{1-\theta_1})$ and $\partial_t u \in L^2([0,T];H^{-\theta_1})$ implying that $u \in H^{1-\theta_1}([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n)$. Therefore, we are in a situation where we have given sense to the Cauchy problem.

Remark 2.7. This is a local in time existence theorem since the life span (2.28) is limited by the choice of λ. Thus the dependence of λ_0 on the coefficient is of crucial importance. In case of Lipschitz coefficients, there is no loss of derivatives; this would correspond to $\lambda = 0$. Using the notations in (2.9) (2.10) and (2.8), the analysis of the proof below shows that there is a function $K_0(\cdot)$ such that one can choose

$$\lambda = \frac{A_{LL}}{\min\{\delta_0, \delta_1\}} \, K_0\big(\frac{A_{L^\infty}}{\delta_0}\big), \tag{2.30}$$

revealing the importance of the LL-norms of the coefficients and the role of the hyperbolicity constant δ_1/δ_0. In particular, it depends only on the second order part of operator L.

Remark 2.8. A closer inspection of the proof, also shows that if the coefficients of the pricipal part of L are $(a_0, a_j, a_{j,k}) = (a'_0 + a''_0, a'_j + a''_j, a'_{j,k} + a''_{j,k})$ with $(a'_0, a'_j, a'_{j,k})$ Lipschitz continous and $(a''_0, a''_j, a''_{j,k})$ Log Lipschitz, with LL norm bounded by A''_{LL}, one can replace A_{LL} by A''_{LL} in the definition of λ. In particular if instead of (1.3) the coefficients satisfy

$$|a(y) - a(y')| \leq C\omega(|y - y'|) \tag{2.31}$$

with a modulus of continuity ω such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0+} \frac{\omega(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon |\mathrm{Log}\varepsilon|} = 0, \tag{2.32}$$

they can be approximated by Lipschtiz functions with errors arbitrarily small in the LL norm. This can be done by usual mollifications, which will preseve the L^∞ bounds A_{L^∞} and keep uniform hyperbolicity constants δ_0 and δ_1. As a consequence, λ can be taken arbitrarily small, yielding global in time existence with arbitrarily small loss of regularity (see Theorem 2.1 in [2] when the coefficients depend only on time).

3 Paradifferential calculus with LL coefficients

In this section we review several known results on paradifferential calculus and give the needed extensions to the case of Log-Lipschitz coefficients.

3.1 The Paley-Littlewood analysis

Introduce $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, real valued, even and such that $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ and

$$\chi(\xi) = 1 \quad \text{for } |\xi| \leq 1.1\,, \qquad \chi(\xi) = 0 \quad \text{for } |\xi| \geq 1.9\,. \tag{3.1}$$

For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, introduce $\chi_k(\xi) := \chi\big(2^{-k}\xi\big)$, $\widetilde{\chi}_k(x)$ its inverse Fourier transform with respect to ξ and the operators

$$\begin{gathered} S_k u := \widetilde{\chi}_k * u = \chi_k(D_x)u\,, \\ \Delta_0 = S_0, \quad \text{and for } k \geq 1 \quad \Delta_k = S_k - S_{k-1}. \end{gathered} \tag{3.2}$$

We note that Δ_k and S_k are self adjoint. Moreover, by evenness, $\widetilde{\chi}_k$ is real, so that Δ_k and S_k preserve reality. For all temperate distributions u one has

$$u = \sum_{k \geq 0} \Delta_k u\,. \tag{3.3}$$

The next propositions immediately follow from the definitions.

Proposition 3.1. *Consider $s \in \mathbb{R}$. A temperate distribution u belongs to $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ [resp. $H^{s \pm \frac{1}{2} log}$] if and only if*

i) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Delta_k u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

ii) the sequence $\delta_k = 2^{ks}\|\Delta_k u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ [resp. $\delta_k = (k+1)^{\pm\frac{1}{2}} 2^{ks}\|\Delta_k u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$] belongs to $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$.

Moreover, the norm of the sequence δ_k in ℓ^2 is equivalent to the norm of u in the given space.

Proposition 3.2. *Consider $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $R > 0$. Suppose that $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of functions in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$such that:*

i) the spectrum of u_0 is contained in $\{|\xi| \leq R\}$ and for $k \geq 1$ the spectrum of u_k is contained in $\big\{\frac{1}{R}\,2^k \leq |\xi| \leq R\,2^k\big\}$.

ii) the sequence $\delta_k = 2^{ks}\|u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ [resp. $\delta_k = (k+1)^{\pm\frac{1}{2}} 2^{ks}\|\Delta_k u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$] belongs to $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$.

Then $u = \sum u_k$ belongs to $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ [resp. $H^{s \pm \frac{1}{2} log}$]. Moreover, the norm of the sequence δ_k in ℓ^2 is equivalent to the norm of u in the given space.

When $s > 0$, it is sufficient to assume that the spectrum of u_k is contained in $\big\{|\xi| \leq R\,2^k\big\}$.

Next we collect several results about the dyadic analysis of LL spaces.

Proposition 3.3. *There is a constant C such that for all $a \in LL(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and all integers $k > 0$*

$$\|\Delta_k a\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ck2^{-k}\|a\|_{LL}. \tag{3.4}$$

Moreover, for all $k \geq 0$

$$\|a - S_k a\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(k+1)\|a\|_{LL} \tag{3.5}$$

$$\|S_k a\|_{Lip} \leq C\Big(\|a\|_{L^\infty} + (k+1)\|a\|_{LL}\Big). \tag{3.6}$$

If $\alpha \in]0,1[$ *and* $a \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)$*, then*

$$\|\Delta_k a\|_{L^\infty} \leq C 2^{-\alpha k}\|a\|_{C^\alpha}. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. S_k is a convolution operator with $\widetilde{\chi}_k$ which is uniformly bounded in L^1. Thus

$$\|S_k a\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|a\|_{L^\infty}. \tag{3.8}$$

Moreover, since the integral of $\partial_j \widetilde{\chi}_k$ vanishes

$$\partial_j(S_k a)(x) = \int \partial_j \widetilde{\chi}_k(y)\big(a(x-y) - a(x)\big)dy.$$

Using the LL smoothness of a yields

$$\|\nabla S_k a\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(k+1)\|a\|_{LL}. \tag{3.9}$$

This implies (3.6). The proof of (3.4) is similar (cf [5]). The third estimate is classical. □

3.2 Paraproducts

Following J.-M. Bony ([1]), for $N \geq 3$ one defines the para-product of a and u as

$$T_a^N u = \sum_{k=N}^{\infty} S_{k-N} a \ \Delta_k u \tag{3.10}$$

The remainder $R_a^N u$ is defined as

$$R_a^N u = au - T_a^N u. \tag{3.11}$$

The next proposition extends classical results (see [1, 11]) to the case of LL coefficients and Log Sobolev spaces.

Proposition 3.4. *i) For $a \in L^\infty$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, T_a^N continuously maps H^s to H^s and $H^{s\pm\frac{1}{2}log}$ to $H^{s\pm\frac{1}{2}log}$. Moreover, the operator norms are uniformly bounded for s in a compact set.*

ii) If $a \in L^\infty \cap LL$ and $N' \geq N \geq 3$, $T_a^N - T_a^{N'}$ maps $H^{s+\frac{1}{2}log}$ into $H^{s+1-\frac{1}{2}log}$, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

iii) If $a \in L^\infty \cap LL$, $N \geq 3$ and $s \in]0,1[$, R_a^N maps $H^{-s+\frac{1}{2}log}$ into $H^{1-s-\frac{1}{2}log}$, and

$$\|R_a^N u\|_{H^{1-s-\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq C\|a\|_{LL}\|u\|_{H^{-s+\frac{1}{2}log}} \tag{3.12}$$

with C uniformly bounded for s in a compact subset of $]0,1[$.

Proof. The first statement is an immediate consequence of (3.8) and Propositions 3.1 and 3.2.

Next, $T_a^N u - T_a^{N'} u = \sum_k v_k$ with $v_k = (S_{k-N}a - S_{k-N'}a)\ \Delta_k u$. By Proposition 3.3

$$\|v_k\|_{L^2} \leq C(k+1)2^{-k}\|\Delta_k u\|_{L^2}.$$

With Proposition 3.2, this implies *ii*).

To prove *iii*) we can assume that $N = 3$. Then

$$R_a u = \sum_{k\geq 3} \Delta_k a\ S_{k-3}u + \sum_k \sum_{|k-j|\leq 2} \Delta_j a \Delta_k u. \tag{3.13}$$

If $u \in H^{-s+\frac{1}{2}log}$, then

$$\|\Delta_j u\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{2^{js}}{\sqrt{j+1}}\varepsilon_j$$

with $\{\varepsilon_j\} \in \ell^2$. We note that the sequence

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon}_k = \sum_{j\leq k} \frac{\sqrt{k+1}}{\sqrt{j+1}} 2^{(j-k)s}\varepsilon_j \tag{3.14}$$

is also in ℓ^2 with

$$\|\widetilde{\varepsilon}_k\|_{\ell^2} \leq C\|\varepsilon_j\|_{\ell^2}$$

with C uniformly bounded when s in a compact subset of $]0,+\infty]$. Thus

$$\|S_{k-3}u\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{2^{ks}}{\sqrt{k+1}}\varepsilon'_k$$

with $\{\varepsilon'_k\} \in \ell^2$. Therefore,

$$\|\Delta_k a\ S_{k-3}u\|_{L^2} \leq C\sqrt{k+1}\ 2^{(s-1)k}\varepsilon'_k.$$

Proposition 3.2 implies that the first sum in (3.13) belongs to $H^{1-s-\frac{1}{2}log}$.

Similarly,

$$\Big\| \sum_{|k-j|\leq 2} \Delta_j a \Delta_k u \Big\|_{L^2} \leq C\sqrt{k+1}\; 2^{(s-1)k} \varepsilon''_k.$$

with $\{\varepsilon''_k\} \in \ell^2$. Now the spectrum of $\Delta_j a \Delta_k u$ is contained in the ball $\{|\xi| \leq 2^{k+3}\}$; because $1-s>0$, Proposition 3.2 implies that the second sum in (3.13) also belongs to $H^{1-s-\frac{1}{2}log}$, and the norm is uniformly bounded when s remains in a compact subset of $[0,1[$. ☐

Remark 3.5. By *ii)* we see that the choice of $N \geq 3$ is essentially irrelevant in our analysis, as in [1]. To simplify notation, we make a definite choice of N, for instance $N=3$, and use the notation T_a and R_a for T_a^N and R_a^N.

Corollary 3.6. *The multiplication $(a,u) \mapsto au$ is continuous from $(L^\infty \cap LL) \times H^{s+\delta log}$ to $H^{s+\delta log}$ for $s \in]-1,1[$ and $\delta \in \{-\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}\}$.*

Proof. (see [5]) Property *iii)* says that R_a is smoothing by almost one derivative in negative spaces, and therefore, for all $\sigma \in]-1,1[$ it maps H^σ to $H^{\sigma'}$ for all $\sigma' > \max\{\sigma, 0\}$ such that $\sigma' < \min\{\sigma+1, 1\}$. Combining this observation with *i)*, the corollary follows. ☐

In particular, we note the following estimate

$$\|au\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq C\big(\|a\|_{L^\infty}\|u\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \|a\|_{LL}\|u\|_{H^s}\big). \tag{3.15}$$

Proposition 3.7. *Consider $q = \sqrt{(1+|\xi|^2)}$ and $\psi(\xi)$ a symbol of degree m on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Denote by $Q = \sqrt{(1-\Delta)}$ and Ψ the associated operators. If $a \in L^\infty \cap LL$, then the commutator $[Q^{-s}\Psi, T_a]$ maps $H^{-s+\frac{1}{2}log}$ into $H^{1-m-\frac{1}{2}log}$ and*

$$\|[Q^{-s}\Psi, T_a]u\|_{H^{1-m-\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq C\|a\|_{LL}\; \|u\|_{H^{-s+\frac{1}{2}log}} \tag{3.16}$$

with C uniformly bounded for $s \in [0,1]$ and ψ in a bounded set.

Proof. We use Theorem 35 of [3], which states that if H is a Fourier multiplier with symbol h of degree 0 and if a is Lipschitzean, then

$$\|[H,a]\partial_{x_j} u\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\nabla_x a\|_{L^\infty}\; \|u\|_{L^2}.$$

For $k>0$, writing $\Delta_k u$ as sum of derivatives, this implies that

$$\|[H,a]\Delta_k u\|_{L^2} \leq C 2^{-k}\|\nabla_x a\|_{L^\infty}\; \|\Delta_k u\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.17}$$

with C independent of k and H, provided that the symbol h remains in a bounded set of symbols of degree 0.

We now proceed to the proof of the proposition. Since Ψ and Q commute with Δ_k, one has

$$[Q^{-s}\Psi, T_a]u = \sum_{k\geq 3}[Q^{-s}\Psi, S_{k-3}a]\Delta_k u. \tag{3.18}$$

Moreover, since the spectrum of $S_{k-3}a\Delta_k u$ is contained in the annulus $2^{k-1} \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{k+2}$, it follows that

$$[Q^{-s}\Psi, S_{k-3}a]\Delta_k = 2^{k(m-s)}[H_k, S_{k-3}a]\Delta_k \tag{3.19}$$

where the symbol of H_k is

$$h_k(\xi) = 2^{k(s-m)}q^{-s}(\xi)\psi(\xi)\varphi(2^{-k}\xi)$$

and φ supported in a suitable fixed annulus. Note that the family $\{h_k\}$ is bounded in the space of symbols of degree 0, uniformly in k, $s \in [0,1]$ and ψ in a bounded set of symbols of degree m. By (3.17), it follows that

$$\|[H_k, S_{k-3}a]\Delta_k u\|_{L^2} \leq C2^{k(m-s-1)}\|\nabla S_{k-3}a\|_{L^\infty}\ \|\Delta_k u\|_{L^2}.$$

Together with (3.9) and Proposition 3.1, this implies that for $u \in H^{-s+\frac{1}{2}log}$,

$$\|[Q^{-s}\Psi, S_{k-3}a]\Delta_k u\| \leq C(k+1)\|a\|_{LL}\ \|\Delta_k u\|_{L^2}.$$

Using Proposition 3.2, the estimate (3.16) follows. $\square$

Proposition 3.8. *If $a \in L^\infty \cap LL$ is real valued, then $\big(T_a - (T_a)^*\big)\partial_{x_j}$ and $\partial_{x_j}\big(T_a - (T_a)^*\big)$ map $H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}$ into $H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}$ and satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\big(T_a - (T_a)^*\big)\partial_{x_j}u\|_{H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq C\|a\|_{LL}\ \|u\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}},\\ &\|\partial_{x_j}\big(T_a - (T_a)^*\big)u\|_{H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq C\|a\|_{LL}\ \|u\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Proof. The $S_k a$ are real valued, since a is real, and the Δ_k are self adjoint, thus

$$(T_a)^* u = \sum_{k=3}^{\infty}\Delta_k\big((S_{k-3}a)\,u\big).$$

Therefore, one has

$$\big(T_a - (T_a)^*\big) = \sum[S_{k-3}a, \Delta_k] = \sum[S_{k-3}a, \Delta_k]\Psi_k$$

where Ψ_k is a Fourier multiplier with symbol $\psi_k = \psi(2^{-k}\xi)$ and ψ is supported in a suitable annulus. Using again [3] (see (3.17)) yields

$$\|[S_{k-3}a, \Delta_k]\partial_{x_j}\Psi_k u\|_{L^2} \leq C(k+1)\|a\|_{LL}\|\Psi_k u\|_{L^2},$$

and a similar estimate when the derivative is on the left of the commutator. Since the spectrum of $[S_{k-3}a, \Delta_k]\Psi_k u$ is contained in a annulus of size $\approx 2^k$, this implies (3.20). ☐

Proposition 3.9. *If a and b belong to $L^\infty \cap LL$, then $\big(T_a T_b - T_{ab}\big)\partial_{x_j}$ maps $H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}$ into $H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}$ and*

$$\begin{aligned}(3.21)\qquad &\|\big(T_a T_b - T_{ab}\big)\partial_{x_j} u\|_{H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}} \\ &\qquad \leq C\Big(\|a\|_{LL}\|b\|_{L^\infty} + \|b\|_{LL}\|a\|_{L^\infty}\Big)\ \|u\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.4, it is sufficient to prove the estimate for any paraproduct T^N. One has

$$T_a^N T_b^N \partial_{x_j} u = \sum_{k\geq N}\sum_{l\geq N} S_{k-N}a\ \Delta_k\Big(S_{l-N}b\ \Delta_l\partial_{x_j}u\Big).$$

In this sum, terms with $|l-k| \leq 2$ vanish, because of the spectral localization of $S_{l-N}b\,\Delta_l\partial_{x_j}$. The commutators $[\Delta_k, S_{l-N}b]$ contribute to terms which are estimated as in (3.18):

$$\|[\Delta_k, S_{l-N}b]\Delta_l\partial_{x_j}u\|_{L^2} \leq C(k+1)\|b\|_{LL}\ \|\Delta_l u\|_{L^2}.$$

If N is large enough, the spectrum of the corresponding term is contained in a annulus of size $\approx 2^k$ and hence the commutators contribute to an error term in (3.21). Therefore, it is sufficient to estimate

$$(3.22)\qquad \sum_{k\geq N}\sum_{l\geq N}\Big(S_{k-N}aS_{l-N}b - S_{k-N}(ab)\Big)\Delta_k\ \Delta_l\partial_{x_j}u.$$

Again, only terms with $|l-k| \leq 2$ contribute to the sum. Using (3.5), one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|a - S_{k-N}a\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C(k+1)2^{-k}\|a\|_{LL},\\ \|b - S_{l-N}b\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C(k+1)2^{-k}\|b\|_{LL},\\ \|ab - S_{k-N}(ab)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C(k+1)2^{-k}\|ab\|_{LL}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\|S_{k-N}aS_{l-N}b - S_{k-N}(ab)\|_{L^\infty}\\ &\qquad \leq C(k+1)2^{-k}\big(\|a\|_{LL}\|b\|_{L^\infty} + \|a\|_{L^\infty}\|b\|_{LL}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Since the terms in the sum (3.22) have their spectrum in annuli of size $\approx 2^k$, this implies that this sum belongs to $H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}$ when $u \in H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}$, with an estimate similar to (3.21). $\square$

3.3 Positivity estimates

The paradifferential calculus sketched above is well adapted to the analysis of high frequencies but does not take into account the low frequencies. For instance, the positivity of the function a does not imply the positivity of the operator T_a in L^2, only the positivity up to a smoothing operator. However, in the derivation of energy estimates, such positivity results are absolutely necessary. To avoid a separate treatment of low frequencies, we introduce *modified paraproducts* for which positivity results hold (we could also introcude weighted paraproducts as in [8, 9, 10]).

Consider a nonnegative integer ν and define the modified paraproducts

$$P_a^\nu u = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} S_{\max\{\nu,k-3\}} a \ \Delta_k u = S_\nu a S_{\nu+2} u + \sum_{k=\nu}^{\infty} S_k a \ \Delta_{k+3} u. \tag{3.23}$$

Then

$$P_a^\nu u - T_a u = \sum_{k=0}^{\nu+2} \sum_{j=\max\{0,k-2\}}^{\nu} \Delta_j a \ \Delta_k u \tag{3.24}$$

and

$$au - P_a^\nu u = \sum_{j=\nu+1}^{\infty} \Delta_j a \ S_{j+2} u. \tag{3.25}$$

The difference (3.24) concerns only low frequencies, and therefore the results of Propositions 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9 are valid if one substitutes P_a^ν in place of T_a, at the cost of additional error terms. In particular, (3.24) and (3.25) immediately imply the following estimates:

Lemma 3.10. *i) There is a constant C such that for all ν, $a \in L^\infty$ and all $u \in L^2$,*

$$\|(P_a^\nu - T_a)\partial_{x_j} u\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_{x_j}(P_a^\nu - T_a)u\|_{L^2} \le C 2^\nu \|a\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.26}$$

ii) There is a constant C_0 such that for all ν for all $a \in LL$ and all $u \in L^2$,

$$\|au - P_a^\nu u\|_{L^2} \le C_0 \nu 2^{-\nu} \|a\|_{LL} \|u\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.27}$$

We will also use the following extension of Proposition 3.8:

Proposition 3.11. *If* $a \in L^\infty \cap LL$ *is real valued, then* $\big(P_a^\nu - (P_a^\nu)^*\big)\partial_{x_j}$ *and* $\partial_{x_j}\big(P_a^\nu - (P_a^\nu)^*\big)$ *map* $H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}$ *into* $H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}$ *and*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\big(P_a^\nu - (P_a^\nu)^*\big)\partial_{x_j}u\|_{H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq C\|a\|_{LL}\big(\|u\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \nu\|u\|_{L^2}\big), \\ &\|\partial_{x_j}\big(P_a^\nu - (P_a^\nu)^*\big)u\|_{H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq C\|a\|_{LL}\big(\|u\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \nu\|u\|_{L^2}\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

Proof. One has

$$\big(P_a^\nu - (P_a^\nu)^*\big)\partial_{x_j}u = [S_\nu a, S_{\nu+2}]\partial_{x_j}u + \sum_{k\geq\nu}[S_k a, \Delta_{k+3}]\partial_{x_j}u.$$

The sum over k is treated exactly as in the proof of Proposition 3.8 and contibutes to the same error term. Using again Theorem 35 of [3], the L^2 norm of the first term is estimated by

$$C\|\nabla_x S_\nu a\|_{L^\infty}\|u\|_{L^2} \leq C(\nu+1)\|a\|_{LL}\|u\|_{L^2}$$

and contibutes to the second error term in (3.28). When the derivative is on the left, the proof is similar. □

Moreover, a comparison of $T_a u$ with au immediately implies the following positivity estimate.

Corollary 3.12. *There is a constant* c_0*, such that for any positive LL-function* a *such that* $\delta = \min a(x) > 0$*, all* ν *such that* $\nu 2^{-\nu} \leq c_0\delta/\|a\|_{LL}$*, and* $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$*,*

$$\mathrm{Re}\big(P_a^\nu u, u\big)_{L^2} \geq \frac{\delta}{2}\|u\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{3.29}$$

Here, $(\cdot,\cdot)_{L^2}$ denotes the scalar product in L^2. This estimate extends to vector valued functions u and matrices a, provided that a is symmetric and positive.

3.4 The time dependent case

In the sequel we will consider functions of $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n$, considered as functions of t with values in various spaces of functions of x. In particular we denote by T_a the operator acting for each fixed t as $T_{a(t)}$:

$$(T_a u)(t) = \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} S_{k-3}(D_x)a(t)\ \Delta_k(D_x)u(t). \tag{3.30}$$

The Propositions 3.4, 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9 apply for each fixed t. There are similar definitions for the modified paraproducts P^ν_a; further, Lemma 3.10 and Corollary 3.12 apply for fixed t.

When a is a Lipschitz function of t, the definition (3.30) immediately implies that

$$[\partial_t, T_a] = T_{\partial_t a}, \qquad [\partial_t, P^\nu_a] = P^\nu_{\partial_t a}. \tag{3.31}$$

When a is only Log Lipschitz this formula does not make sense, since $\partial_t a$ is not defined as a function. The idea, already used in [4, 5], is that it is sufficient to commute ∂_t with time regularization of a. In our context, this simply means that in (3.30), we will replace the term $S_{k-3}a$, which is a spatial regularization of a, by a space-time regularization, namely $S_{k-3}a_k$ where a_k is a suitable time mollification of a. We now give the details for P^ν, as we will need them in the next section.

Introduce the mollifiers

$$\jmath_k(t) = 2^k \jmath(2^k t) \tag{3.32}$$

where $\jmath \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R})$ is non negative, with integral over $\mathbb{R}$ equal to 1.

Definition 3.13. *Given $a \in L^\infty \cap LL([0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, define*

$$a_k(t, x) = \jmath_k *_t \tilde{a} = \int \jmath_k(t-s)\tilde{a}(s, x)ds \tag{3.33}$$

where $\tilde{a}$ is the LL extension of a given by

$$\tilde{a}(t, x) = a(0, x), \quad t \le 0, \qquad \tilde{a}(t, x) = a(T_0, x), \quad t \ge T_0. \tag{3.34}$$

Next, for fixed t, the operator $\widetilde{T}_{a(t)}$ is defined by

$$\widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)} u = S_\nu a_\nu S_{\nu+2} u + \sum_{k=\nu}^{\infty} S_k a_k \ \Delta_{k+3} u. \tag{3.35}$$

We denote by $\widetilde{P}^\nu_a$ the operator acting on functions of (t, x) by $(\widetilde{P}^n u_a u)(t) = \widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)} u(t)$.

Proposition 3.14. *Let $a \in L^\infty \cap LL([0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. Then for each $t \in [0, T_0]$, the operators $R_1(t) = (P^\nu_{a(t)} - \widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)})\partial_{x_j}$, $R_2(t) = \partial_{x_j}(P^\nu_{a(t)} - \widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)})$, $R_3(t) = \big((\widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)})^* - \widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)}\big)\partial_{x_j}$, $R_4(t) = \partial_{x_j}\big((\widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)})^* - \widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)}\big)$, and $R_5(t) = [D_t, \widetilde{P}^\nu_a](t)$ map $H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}$ into $H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}$ and there is a constant C such that for all $t \in [0, T_0]$ and for $k = 1, \ldots, 5$,*

$$\|R_k u\|_{H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}} \le C\|a\|_{LL}\big(\|u\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \nu\|u\|_{L^2}\big). \tag{3.36}$$

Proof. **a)** First, we recall several estimates from [5]. For $a \in LL([0,T_0]\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ the difference $a - a_k$ satisfies

$$|a(t,x) - a_k(t,x)| \le C(k+1)2^{-k}\|a\|_{LL}, \tag{3.37}$$

$$|\partial_t a_k(t,x)| \le C(k+1)\|a\|_{LL}. \tag{3.38}$$

with C independent of t and x. In particular, we note that

$$\|S_k(a(t) - a_k(t))\|_{L^\infty} \le C(k+1)2^{-k}\|a\|_{LL}. \tag{3.39}$$

b) In accordance with (3.35), for $l = 1, 2, 5$, we split R_l in two terms

$$R_l(t)u = B_l u + H_l u, \quad H_l u = \sum_{k\ge\nu} w_k \tag{3.40}$$

with $B_l u$ spectrally supported in the ball of radius $2^{\nu+4}$ and with w_k spectrally supported in an annulus $|\xi| \approx 2^k$. For R_1,

$$B_1 u = S_\nu(a(t) - a_\nu(t))\ S_{\nu+2}\partial_{x_j} u, \quad w_k = S_k(a(t) - a_k(t))\ \Delta_{k+3}\partial_{x_j} u.$$

With (3.39), this implies that

$$\|B_1 u\|_{L^2} \le C(\nu+1)\|a\|_{LL}\|u\|_{L^2}$$

and

$$\|w_k\|_{L^2} \le C(k+1)\|a\|_{LL}\|\Delta_{k+3}u\|_{L^2},$$

implying that

$$\|H_1 u\|_{H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}} \le C\|a\|_{LL}\|u\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}}.$$

For R_2, the analysis is similar. One has

$$B_2 u = \partial_{x_j}\big(S_\nu(a(t) - a_\nu(t))\ S_{\nu+2}u\big), \quad w_k = \partial_{x_j}\big(S_k(a(t) - a_k(t))\ \Delta_{k+3}u\big).$$

Thanks to the spectral localization, the estimates for $B_2 u$ and w_k are the same as in the case of R_1, implying that

$$\|B_2 u\|_{L^2} \le C(\nu+1)\|a\|_{LL}\|u\|_{L^2} \tag{3.41}$$

$$\|H_2 u\|_{H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}} \le C\|a\|_{LL}\|u\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}}. \tag{3.42}$$

c) For $k = 5$ we write (3.40) with

$$B_5 u = S_\nu(\partial_t a_\nu(t))\ \Delta_{\nu+2}u, \quad w_k = S_k(\partial_t a_k(t))\ \Delta_{k+3}u.$$

Thus the estimates (3.38) imply

$$\begin{aligned}&\|B_5 u\|_{L^2} \leq C(\nu+1)\|a\|_{LL}\|u\|_{L^2}\\ &\|H_5 u\|_{H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq C\|a\|_{LL}\|u\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}}.\end{aligned}$$

c) One has

$$R_3(t) = R_1(t) + R_2^*(t) + \big((P^\nu_{a(t)})^* - P^\nu_{a(t)}\big)\partial_{x_j}.$$

The third term is estimated in Proposition 3.11. The operators R_1 and $R_2^* = B_2^* + H_2^*$ are estimated in part b), implying that R_3 satisfies (3.36) for $k = 3$. The proof for $R_4 = R_3^* = R_1^* + R_2 + \partial_{x_j}\big((P^\nu_{a(t)})^* - P^\nu_{a(t)}\big)$ is similar.

This finishes the proof of the Proposition. □

Lemma 3.15. *There is a constant C_0 such that for any $a \in LL([0,T_0]\times\mathbb{R}^n)$, $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\nu \geq 0$ and all $t \in [0,T_0]$, one has*

$$\|a(t)u - \widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)}u\|_{L^2} \leq C_0\nu 2^{-\nu}\|a\|_{LL}\,\|u\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.43}$$

Proof. We have

$$au - \widetilde{P}^\nu_a u = (a - S_\nu a_\nu)S_{\nu+2}u + \sum_{k=\nu}^{\infty}(a - S_k a_k)\ \Delta_{k+3}u.$$

Combining (3.5) and (3.39), we see that

$$\|a(t) - S_k a_k(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ck2^{-k}\|a\|_{LL}.$$

This implies (3.43). □

The lemma immediately implies the following positivity estimate.

Corollary 3.16. *There is a constant c_0, such that for any positive LL-function a such that $\delta = \min a(t,x) > 0$, all ν such that $\nu 2^{-\nu} \leq c_0\delta/\|a\|_{LL}$, and $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$,*

$$\mathrm{Re}\big(P^\nu_{a(t)}u, u\big)_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \geq \frac{\delta}{2}\|u\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \tag{3.44}$$

The same result holds for vector valued functions u and definite positive square matrices a.

Finally, we quote the following commutation result which will be needed in the next section.

Proposition 3.17. *Suppose that* $a \in LL([0,T_0]\times\mathbb{R}^n)$. *Then* $\Lambda^{\frac12}[\widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)},\Lambda^{\frac12}]$ *and* $[\widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)},\Lambda^{\frac12}]\Lambda^{\frac12}$ *are bounded in* L^2 *and satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Lambda^{\frac12}[\widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)},\Lambda^{\frac12}]u\|_{L^2} + \|[\widetilde{P}^\nu_{a(t)},\Lambda^{\frac12}]\Lambda^{\frac12}u\|_{L^2}\\ \le C\big(\nu^2 2^{-\nu}\|a\|_{LL}+\nu\|a\|_{L^\infty}\big)\|u\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Thanks to the spectral localisation, the low frequency part $S_\nu a_\nu S_{\nu+2}$ in $\widetilde{P}^\nu_a$ contributes to terms whose L^2 norm is bounded by

$$C\nu\|u\|_{L^2}.$$

The commutator with the high frequency part reads

$$\sum_{k\ge\nu}[\Lambda^{\frac12},S_k a_k]\Delta_{k+3}u.$$

We argue as in the proof of Proposition 3.7 and write

$$[\Lambda^{\frac12},S_k a_k]\Delta_{k+3} = (k+1)^{\frac12}\,[H_k,S_k a_k]\Delta_{k+3} \tag{3.45}$$

where the symbol of H_k is $h_k(\xi)=(k+1)^{-\frac12}(\mathrm{Log}(2+|\xi|))^{\frac12}\varphi(2^{-k}\xi)$ and φ is supported in a suitable fixed annulus. Note that the family $\{h_k\}$ is bounded in the space of symbols of degree 0. By (3.17), one has

$$\|[H_k,S_k a(t)]\Lambda^{\frac12}\Delta_{k+3}u\|_{L^2}\le C(k+1)2^{-k}\|\nabla_x S_k a_k(t)\|_{L^\infty}\|\Delta_k u\|_{L^2}.$$

Since $\nabla_x S_k a_k = (\nabla_x S_k a)*\jmath_k$, its L^∞ norm is bounded by $Ck\|a\|_{LL}$. Adding up, and using the spectral localization, these terms contribute a function whose L^2 norm is bounded by $C\nu^2 2^{-\nu}\|a\|_{LL}\|u\|_{L^2}$.

When $\Lambda^{\frac12}$ is on the left of the commutator, the analysis is similar. ☐

4 Proof of the main results

4.1 The main estimate

We consider the operator (2.1) with coefficients which satisfy (2.4), (2.5) and (2.6). We fix $\theta<\theta_1$ in $]1-\alpha,\alpha[$, and with λ to be chosen later, we introduce the notation

$$s(t)=\theta+t\lambda. \tag{4.1}$$

Recall that

$$T = \min\big\{T_0, \frac{\theta_1 - \theta}{\lambda}\big\}. \tag{4.2}$$

Note that for $t \in [0, T]$, $s(t)$ remains in $[\theta, \theta_1] \subset]1 - \alpha, \alpha[$.

We will consider solutions of the Cauchy problem

$$Lu = f, \quad u_{|t=0} = u_0, \quad Xu_{|t=0} = u_1 \tag{4.3}$$

with

$$u \in \mathcal{H}_{1-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T), \qquad \partial_t u \in \mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T), \tag{4.4}$$

$$u_0 \in H^{1-\theta}(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad u_1 \in H^{-\theta}(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{4.5}$$

$$f = f_1 + f_2, \quad f_1 \in \mathcal{L}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T), \quad f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_{-\theta-\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T), \tag{4.6}$$

Note that if u and f satisfy (4.4) and (4.6), then

$$u \in L^2([0, T]; H^{1-\theta_1}), \quad \partial_t u \in L^2([0, T]; H^{-\theta_1}), \tag{4.7}$$

$$f \in L^1([0, T]; H^{-\theta_2}) \tag{4.8}$$

for all $\theta_2 \in]\theta_1, \alpha[$, so that the meaning of the Cauchy condition is clear.

The main step in the proof of Theorem 2.6 is the following:

Theorem 4.1. *There is a $\lambda_0 \geq 0$ of the form* (2.30) *such that for $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ there is a constant K such that: for all f, u_0 and u_1 satisfying* (4.5) (4.6)*, and all u satisfying* (4.4) *solution of the Cauchy problem* (4.3)*, then*

$$u \in \mathcal{C}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T), \quad \partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T) \tag{4.9}$$

and u satisfies the energy estimate (2.29)*.*

This theorem contains two pieces of information : first an energy estimate for smooth u, see Propositions 4.3 and 4.4. By a classical argument, smoothing the coefficients and passing to the limit, this estimate allows for the construction of weak solutions, see Section 5.2. The second piece of information contained in the theorem is a "weak=strong" type result showing that for data as in the theorem, any (weak) solution u satisfying (4.4) is the limit of smooth (approximate) solutions, in the norm given by the left hand side of the energy estimate, implying that u satisfies the additional smoothness (4.9) and the energy estimate. This implies uniqueness of weak solutions.

The idea is to get an energy estimate by integration by parts, from the analysis of

$$2\mathrm{Re}\langle Lu, e^{-2\gamma t}(1-\Delta_x)^{-s(t)}Xu\rangle \tag{4.10}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the L^2 scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^n$ extended to the Hermitian symmetric duality $H^\sigma \times H^{-\sigma}$ for all $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, and Δ_x denote the Laplace operator on $\mathbb{R}^d$. This extends the analysis of [5] where $X = \partial_t$. The parameter γ is chosen at the end to absorb classical error terms (present for Lipschitz coefficients) while the parameter λ which enters in the definition of $s(t)$, is chosen to absorb extra error terms coming from the loss of smoothness of the coefficients.

To prove Theorem 4.1, the first idea would be to mollify the equation. However, the lack of smoothness of the coefficients does not allow us to use this method directly and we cannot prove that the weak solutions are limits of exact smooth solutions. Instead, the idea is to write the equation as a system (2.16) for (u,v) and mollify this system. This leads to the consideration of the equations:

$$\begin{cases} Y^*v + \tilde{b}_0 v = \tilde{L}_2 u - \tilde{L}_1 u - \tilde{d}u + f, \\ Yu + \tilde{c}_0 u = v/a_0 + g. \end{cases} \tag{4.11}$$

In this form, the commutator of spatial mollifiers with ∂_t are trivial, and we can prove that weak solutions of (4.11) are limits of smooth solutions, $(u^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon)$ with $g^\varepsilon \neq 0$, which thus do not correspond to exact solutions u^ε of (4.3).

Notations. It is important for our purpose to keep track of the dependence of the various constants on the Log-Lipschitz norms. In particular we will use the notations δ_0, δ_1 of (2.8) and A_{LL}, A_{L^∞}, B of (2.9) (2.10). To simplify the exposition, we will denote by C, K_0 and K constants which may vary from one line to another, C denoting universal constants depending only on the paradifferential calculus; K_0 depending also on A_{L^∞}/δ_0; K, still independent of the parameters (γ, ε), but dependent also on δ_0, δ_1, θ_0, θ_1 and the various norms of the coefficients.

4.2 Estimating v

First, we give estimates that link v and $\partial_t u$.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that* u *satisfies* (4.4). *Then* $v = Xu + c_0 u$ *belongs to the space* $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T) \subset L^2([0,T]; H^{-\theta_1})$ *and for almost all* t,

$$\begin{aligned} \|v(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq & C A_{L^\infty} \big(\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} \big) \\ & + C(A_{LL} + B) \big(\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)}} + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)}} \big), \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq & K_0 \|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \frac{C}{\delta_0} \|v(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} \\ & + K \big(\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)}} + \|v(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)}} \big). \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

There are similar estimates in the spaces H^s *without the* $\frac{1}{2}log$.

If in addition $Lu = f$ *with* f *satisfying* (4.6), *then* $\partial_t v \in L^1([0,T]; H^{-1-\theta_1})$.

Proof. **a)** First, we note that the multiplication $(a, u) \mapsto au$ is continuous from $(L^\infty \cap LL)([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$ to $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$. Indeed, the corresponding norm estimate of the product is clear for smooth u, from (3.15) integrated in time. The claim follows by density. In particular, this shows that $a_0 \partial_t u$ and the $a_j \partial_{x_j} u$ belong to $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$. Similarly, the estimate

$$\|bu(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq C \|bu(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)}} \leq C \|b\|_{C^\alpha} \|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)}} \tag{4.14}$$

implies that $c_0 u \in \mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$. Therefore $v \in \mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$ and the estimate (4.12) holds. The proof of (4.13) is similar, noting that

$$\partial_t u = \frac{1}{a_0} v - \sum_{j=1}^{d} \frac{a_j}{a_0} \partial_{x_j} u - \frac{c_0}{a_0} u.$$

b) As in the proof of Lemma 2.2, we see that the equation implies that

$$\partial_t v = f - \sum_{j=1}^{d} \partial_{x_j} (\tilde{a}_j v) - \tilde{b}_0 v + \tilde{L}_2 u - \tilde{L}_1 u - \tilde{d} u.$$

The conservative form of $\tilde{L}_2$ and the multiplicative properties above show that

$$\partial_{x_j}(\tilde{a}_j v),\ \tilde{L}_2 u \in \mathcal{H}_{-\theta-1+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T) \subset L^2([0,T]; H^{-1-\theta_1}).$$

Similarly, $\tilde{L}_1 u$ and $\tilde{b}_0 v$ belong to $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$ and thus to $L^2([0,T]; H^{-\theta_1})$. The last term $\tilde{u}$ is in L^2. Therefore, $\partial_t v - f \in L^2([0,T]; H^{-1-\theta_1})$. Since $f \in L^1([0,T]; H^{-\theta_2})$ for $\theta_2 \in]\theta_1, \alpha[$, the lemma follows. ☐

Next, we give a-priori estimates in the space $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)\cap\mathcal{C}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ for smooth solutions of

$$(Y^*+\tilde{c}_0)v=\varphi,\quad v_{|t=0}=v_0. \tag{4.15}$$

We define the operators

$$(Qv)(t)=(1-\Delta_x)^{-s(t)/2}v(t),\quad (Q_\gamma v)(t)=e^{-\gamma t}(Qv)(t). \tag{4.16}$$

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that $v\in L^2([0,T];H^1)$ and $\partial_t v\in L^1([0,T];L^2)$. Then the functions $v_\gamma(t):=Q_\gamma v$ belong to $C^0([0,T],L^2)$ and satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned}&\|v_\gamma(t)\|^2_{L^2}+2\int_0^t\|(\gamma+\lambda\Lambda)^{1/2}v_\gamma(t')\|^2_{L^2}dt'\\&\qquad\le 2\int_0^t\langle(Y^*+\tilde{c}_0)v(t'),Q^2_\gamma(t')v(t')\rangle\,dt'+\|v_{\gamma,\varepsilon}(0)\|^2_{L^2}\\&\qquad\quad+\int_0^t F(t')dt'\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

with

$$F(t')\le K_0\frac{A_{LL}}{\delta_0}\|e^{-\gamma t'}\Lambda^{1/2}v(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')}}+K\|v(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')}}. \tag{4.18}$$

Proof. **a)** Since $v\in L^2([0,T];H^1)$ and $\partial_t v\in L^1([0,T];L^2)$, we have

$$\partial_t Q_\gamma v=Q_\gamma\partial_t v-(\gamma+\lambda\Lambda)Q_\gamma v\in L^1([0,T];L^2) \tag{4.19}$$

as immediately seen using the spatial Fourier transform. Moreover, $v_\gamma=Q_\gamma v\in C^0([0,T];L^2)$ and satisfies the following identity

$$\|v_\gamma(t)\|^2_{L^2}-\|v_\gamma(0)\|^2_{L^2}=2\mathrm{Re}\int_0^t\langle\partial_t Q_\gamma v,Q_\gamma v\rangle\,dt'.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}&2\mathrm{Re}\int_0^t\langle\partial_t v,Q^2_\gamma v\rangle\,dt'=2\mathrm{Re}\int_0^t\langle Q_\gamma\partial_t v,Q_\gamma v\rangle\,dt'\\&\quad=\|v_\gamma(t)\|^2_{L^2}-\|v_\gamma(0)\|^2_{L^2}+2\int_0^t\|(\gamma+\lambda\Lambda)^{1/2}v_\gamma(t')\|^2_{L^2}dt'\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

b) Next we consider the terms $\partial_{x_j}(\tilde{a}_j v)$. We note that they belong to $L^2([0,T];H^{-\sigma})$ for all $\sigma>0$. In particular, since $s(t)\ge\theta>0$, we note that the pairing

$$\langle\partial_{x_j}(\tilde{a}_j v),Q^2_\gamma v\rangle$$

is well defined. We give an estimate for

$$2\mathrm{Re}\int_0^t \langle \partial_{x_j}(\tilde a_j v), Q_\gamma^2 v\rangle dt',$$

using the decomposition

$$\tilde a_j v = T_{\tilde a_j} v + R_{\tilde a_j} v.$$

By Proposition 3.4 it follows

$$\|R_{\tilde a_j} v(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)-\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq C\|\tilde a_j\|_{LL}\|v(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}}$$

since $s(t) \in [\theta, \theta_1] \subset]0, 1[$. Moreover,

$$\|Q_\gamma^2 v(t)\|_{H^{s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq Ce^{-2\gamma t}\|v(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle \partial_{x_j} R_{\tilde a_j} v(t), Q_{\gamma,\varepsilon}^2 v(t)\rangle| &\leq \|R_{\tilde a_j} v(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)-\frac{1}{2}log}} \ \|Q_{\gamma,\varepsilon}^2 v(t)\|_{H^{s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} \\ &\leq C\|\tilde a_j\|_{LL} e^{-2\gamma t}\|v(t)\|^2_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}}.\end{aligned}$$

It remains to consider

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Re}\langle \partial_{x_j} T_{\tilde a_j} v, Q_\gamma^2 v\rangle &= \mathrm{Re}\langle Q_\gamma \partial_{x_j} T_{\tilde a_j} v, Q_\gamma v\rangle \\ &= \mathrm{Re}\langle \partial_{x_j} T_{\tilde a_j} Q_\gamma v, Q_\gamma v\rangle + \mathrm{Re}\langle \partial_{x_j}[Q_\gamma, T_{\tilde a_j}]v, Q_\gamma v\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Note that these computations make sense because $v(t) \in H^1$ and all the pairings are well defined. Proposition 3.7 implies that

$$\|\langle \partial_{x_j}[Q_\gamma, T_{\tilde a_j}]v(t)\|_{0-\frac{1}{2}log} \leq Ce^{-\gamma t}\|\tilde a_j\|_{LL}\|v(t)\|_{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}$$

and therefore

$$|\langle \partial_{x_j}[Q_\gamma, T_{\tilde a_j}]v(t), Q_\gamma v(t)\rangle| \leq C\|\tilde a_j\|_{LL} e^{-2\gamma t}\|v(t)\|^2_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}}. \tag{4.21}$$

Next, for $v_\gamma(t) \in H^{2-\theta_1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}2\mathrm{Re}\langle \partial_{x_j} T_{\tilde a_j} v_\gamma, v_\gamma\rangle &= \mathrm{Re}\langle (\partial_{x_j} T_{\tilde a_j} - T^*_{\tilde a_j}\partial_{x_j})v_\gamma, v_\gamma\rangle \\ &= \mathrm{Re}\langle (T_{\tilde a_j} - T^*_{\tilde a_j})\partial_{x_j} v_\gamma, v_\gamma\rangle + \mathrm{Re}\langle [\partial_{x_j}, T_{\tilde a_j}]\partial_{x_j} v_\gamma,, v_\gamma\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Using Propositions 3.8 and 3.7, one can bound both terms by the right hand side of (4.21). Adding up, we have proved that

$$\big|2\mathrm{Re}\int_0^t \langle \partial_{x_j}(\tilde a_j v), Q_\gamma^2 v\rangle\, dt'\big| \leq C\|\tilde a_j\|_{LL}\int_0^t \|e^{-\gamma t'}\Lambda^{1/2} v(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t)}} dt'.$$

c) The zero-th order term is clearly a remainder, and the multiplicative properties imply that

$$|\langle \tilde{c}_0 v(t), Q_\gamma^2 v(t)\rangle \leq K\|v(t)\|^2_{H^{-s(t)}}.$$

d) We note that

$$\begin{aligned}\|a_j/a_0\|_{LL} &\leq \|a_j\|_{LL}\|\|1/a_0\|_{L^\infty} + \|a_j\|_{L^\infty}\|\|1/a_0\|_{LL}\\ &\leq \frac{A_{LL}}{\delta_0} + \frac{A_{L^\infty}A_{LL}}{\delta_0^2} \leq 2\frac{A_{L^\infty}A_{LL}}{\delta_0^2},\end{aligned}$$

since $\delta_0 \leq a_0 \leq A_{L^\infty}$. Using identity (4.20) and the estimates of parts b) and c), implies (4.17) and so the proof of the Lemma is complete. □

4.3 Estimating $\nabla_x u$

We now get estimates of $\nabla_x u$ from the analysis of

$$-2\mathrm{Re}\langle \widetilde{L}_2 u, Q_\gamma^2 X u\rangle = -\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} 2\mathrm{Re}\langle \partial_{x_j}(\tilde{a}_{j,k}\partial_{x_k} u), Q_\gamma^2 X u\rangle \tag{4.22}$$

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that* $u \in L^2([0,T];H^2)$ *with* $\partial_t u \in L^2([0,T];H^1)$. *Then* $u_\gamma := Q_\gamma u \in C^0([0,T],H^1)$ *and*

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\delta_0\delta_1\|\nabla_x u_\gamma(t)\|^2_{L^2} + \int_0^t \delta_0\delta_1\|(\gamma+\lambda\Lambda)^{1/2}\nabla_x u_\gamma(t')\|^2_{L^2}dt'\\ &\leq -2\mathrm{Re}\int_0^t \langle \widetilde{L}_2 u, Q_\gamma^2 v\rangle\, dt' + CA^2_{L^\infty}\|\nabla_x u_\gamma(0)\|^2_{L^2} + \int_0^t E(t')dt',\end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}&|E(t)| \leq\\ &\qquad K_0 A_{LL}A_{L^\infty}e^{-2\gamma t}\big(\|u(t)\|^2_{H^{1-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \frac{1}{\delta_0^2}\|Xu(t)\|^2_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}}\big)\\ &\qquad + Ke^{-2\gamma t}\big(\|u(t)\|^2_{H^{1-s(t)}} + \|Xu(t)\|^2_{H^{-s(t)}}\big).\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

To simplify the exposition, we note here that all the dualities $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ written below make sense, thanks to the smoothness assumption on u. This will not be repeated at each step. Moreover, in the proof below, we assume that u itself is smooth (in time).

Proof. **a)** We first perform several reductions. Using *iii)* of Proposition 3.4, one shows that

$$\langle \partial_{x_j}(\tilde a_{j,k}\partial_{x_k}u), Q_\gamma^2 X u\rangle = \langle \partial_{x_j}(T_{\tilde a_{j,k}}\partial_{x_k}u), Q_\gamma^2 X u\rangle + E_1$$

with

$$|E_1(t)| \le C\|\tilde a_{j,k}\|_{LL}\|\partial_{x_k}u(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac12 log}}\|Q_\gamma^2 X u(t)\|_{H^{s(t)+\frac12 log}}. \tag{4.25}$$

Since $\|\tilde a_{j,k}\|_{LL} \le K_0 A_{LL} \le K_0 A_{LL} A_{L^\infty}/\delta_0$, E_1 satisfies (4.24). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \partial_{x_j}(T_{\tilde a_{j,k}}\partial_{x_k}u), Q_\gamma^2 X u\rangle &= \langle \partial_{x_j} Q_{\gamma,\varepsilon} T_{\tilde a_{j,k}}\partial_{x_k}u, Q_\gamma X u\rangle + \\ &= \langle \partial_{x_j} T_{\tilde a_{j,k}}\partial_{x_k} Q_\gamma u, Q_\gamma X u\rangle + E_2\end{aligned}$$

where E_2 also satisfies (4.25), and hence (4.24).

b) Next we write

$$Xu = T_{a_0}\partial_t u + \sum T_{a_j}\partial_{x_j}u + r$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|r(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)-\frac12 log}} \le C A_{LL}\big(\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)+\frac12 log}} + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac12 log}}\big) \\ + CB\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)}}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, r contributes to an error term $E_3 = \langle \partial_{x_j} T_{\tilde a_{j,k}}\partial_{x_k} Q_\gamma u, Q_\gamma r\rangle$ such that

$$|E_3(t)| \le e^{-2\gamma t} K_0 A_{L^\infty}\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)+\frac12 log}}\|r(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)-\frac12 log}}.$$

Using (4.13) in the estimate of r, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}|E_3(t)| \le e^{-2\gamma t} K_0 A_{L^\infty} A_{LL}\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)+\frac12 log}} \\ \Big(\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)+\frac12 log}} + \frac{1}{\delta_0}\|Xu(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac12 log}} \\ + K\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)}} + K\|Xu(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)}}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

and hence satisfies (4.24).

c) Consider now the term

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \partial_{x_j} T_{\tilde a_{j,k}}\partial_{x_k} Q_\gamma u, Q_\gamma T_{a_0}\partial_t u\rangle &= -\langle T_{\tilde a_{j,k}}\partial_{x_k} Q_\gamma u, \partial_{x_j} Q_\gamma T_{a_0}\partial_t u\rangle \\ &= -\langle T_{\tilde a_{j,k}}\partial_{x_k} Q_\gamma u, T_{a_0}\partial_{x_j} Q_\gamma \partial_t u\rangle + E_4 \\ &= -\langle (T_{a_0})^* T_{\tilde a_{j,k}}\partial_{x_k} Q_\gamma u, \partial_{x_j} Q_\gamma \partial_t u\rangle + E_4 \\ &= -\langle T_{a_0} T_{\tilde a_{j,k}}\partial_{x_k} Q_\gamma u, \partial_{x_j} Q_\gamma \partial_t u\rangle + E_4 + E_5 \\ &= -\langle T_{a_0\tilde a_{j,k}}\partial_{x_k} Q_\gamma u, \partial_{x_j} Q_\gamma \partial_t u\rangle + E_4 + E_5 + E_6\end{aligned}$$

where E_4, E_5 and E_6 are estimated by Proposition 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9 respectively. They all satisfy

$$|E_k(t)| \le Ce^{-2\gamma t} A \|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}}.$$

with $A = \|\tilde{a}_{j,k}\|_{LL}\|a_0\|_{L^\infty} + \|\tilde{a}_{j,k}\|_{L^\infty}\|a_0\|_{LL} \le K_0 A_{L^\infty} A_{LL}$. Again using (4.13) to replace $\partial_t u$ by Xu, one shows that these errors satisfy (4.24).

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle \partial_{x_j} T_{\tilde{a}_{j,k}} \partial_{x_k} Q_\gamma u, Q_\gamma T_{a_l} \partial_{x_l} u\rangle \\ &\qquad\qquad = -\langle T_{a_l \tilde{a}_{j,k}} \partial_{x_k} Q_\gamma u, \partial_{x_l} \partial_{x_j} Q_\gamma u\rangle + E_7\end{aligned}$$

where E_7 satisfies

$$|E_7(t)| \le Ce^{-2\gamma t} K_0 A_{L^\infty} A_{LL} \|u(t)\|^2_{H^{1-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} \tag{4.26}$$

thus (4.24).

d) Introduce the notation

$$w_j = \partial_{x_j} Q_\gamma u. \tag{4.27}$$

Because $\tilde{a}_{j,k} = \tilde{a}_{k,j}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Re}\langle T_{a_l \tilde{a}_{j,k}} w_k, \partial_{x_l} w_j\rangle + \mathrm{Re}\langle T_{a_l \tilde{a}_{k,j}} w_j, \partial_{x_l} w_k\rangle \\ &\qquad\qquad = \mathrm{Re}\langle ((T_{a_l \tilde{a}_{j,k}})^* \partial_{x_l} - \partial_{x_l} T_{a_l \tilde{a}_{j,k}}) w_k, w_j\rangle := E_8\end{aligned}$$

Using Propositions 3.8 and 3.7, one shows that E_8 satisfies

$$|E_8(t)| \le C\|a_l \tilde{a}_{j,k}\|_{LL} \|w_j(t)\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}} \|w_k(t)\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}}$$

and therefore E_8 also satisfies (4.26) thus (4.24).

e) It remains to consider the sum

$$S := \mathrm{Re} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \langle T_{b_{j,k}} \partial_{x_k} Q_\gamma u, \partial_{x_j} Q_\gamma \partial_t u\rangle \tag{4.28}$$

with $b_{j,k} = a_0 \tilde{a}_{j,k} = a_0 a_{,k} + a_j a_k$. By the strict hyperbolicity assumption (2.8), it follows for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} b_{j,k}(t,x) \xi_j \xi_k \ge \delta_0 \delta_1 |\xi|^2.$$

Therefore, we can use Corollary 3.16. Since $\|b_{j,k}\|_{LL} \leq 2A_{L^\infty}A_{LL}$, there exists an integer ν, with

$$\frac{2^\nu}{\nu} \approx \frac{A_{L^\infty}A_{LL}}{\delta}, \tag{4.29}$$

such that for all $t \in [0, T_0]$ and $(w_1, \dots, w_n)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the following estimate is satisfied

$$\operatorname{Re} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \langle P^\nu_{b_{j,k}(t)} w_k, w_j \rangle \geq \frac{\delta_0\delta_1}{2}\|w\|^2_{L^2} \tag{4.30}$$

From now on we fix such a ν and use the notation P_b in place of P^ν_b.

Using Lemma 3.10 and Proposition 3.14, we see that

$$\|\partial_{x_j} T_{b_{j,k}} w_k - \partial_{x_j} \widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} w_k\|_{H^{0-\frac{1}{2}log}} \leq C\|b_{j,k}\|_{LL}\Big(\|w_k\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}} + K\|w_k\|_{L^2}\Big)$$

Therefore

$$S = \operatorname{Re} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \langle \widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} \partial_{x_k} Q_\gamma u, \partial_{x_j} Q_\gamma \partial_t u \rangle + E_9$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |E_9(t)| \leq Ce^{-2\gamma t}\|b_{j,k}\|_{LL}\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}}\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} \\ + e^{-2\gamma t}\nu K\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)}}\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.13), implies that E_9 satisfies (4.24).

Next, we use Proposition 3.14 to replace $\partial_{x_j}\widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}}$ by $\frac{1}{2}\partial_{x_j}(\widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} + (\widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}})^*)$ at the cost of an error E_{10} similar to E_9.

At this stage, we commute Q_γ and ∂_t as in (4.19). Using the notation (4.27), yields

$$\begin{aligned} 2S = &\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \operatorname{Re}\langle(\widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} + (\widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}})^*)w_k, \partial_t w_j\rangle \\ &+ \gamma \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \operatorname{Re}\langle(\widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} + (\widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}})^*)w_k, w_j\rangle \\ &+ \lambda \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \operatorname{Re}\langle(\widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} + (\widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}})^*)w_k, \Lambda w_j\rangle + 2E_9 + 2E_{10}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

We denote by S^1, S^2 and S^3 the sums on the right hand side.

f) The symmetry $b_{j,k} = b_{k,j}$ implies the identity

$$S^1 = \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \mathrm{Re}\langle \widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} w_k, w_j \rangle + E_{11}$$

where

$$E_{11} = \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \mathrm{Re}\langle [\widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}}, \partial_t] w_k, w_j \rangle$$

is estimated using Proposition 3.14:

$$\begin{aligned} |E_{11}(t)| &\leq C \|b_{j,k}\|_{LL} \big(\|w(t)\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \nu \|w\|_{L^2} \big) \|w(t)\|_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}} \\ &\leq C e^{-2\gamma t} \|b_{j,k}\|_{LL} \|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} \\ &\qquad\qquad \big(\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \nu \|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)}} \big) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore satisfies (4.24). Moreover,

$$\mathrm{Re}\langle \widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} w_k, \Lambda w_j \rangle = \mathrm{Re}\langle \widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} w_k, \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} w_j \rangle + \mathrm{Re}\langle \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}, \widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}},] w_k, w_j \rangle$$

$$\mathrm{Re}\langle (\widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}})^* w_k, \Lambda w_j \rangle = \mathrm{Re}\langle \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} w_k, \widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} w_j \rangle + \mathrm{Re}\langle w_k, [\widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}}, \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}] \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} w_j \rangle.$$

We use Proposition 3.17 to estimate the commutators and

$$S^3 = 2 \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \mathrm{Re}\langle \widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} w_k, \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} w_j \rangle + E_{12}$$

where

$$|E_{12}(t)| \leq K \|w(t)\|^2_{L^2} \leq K \|u(t)\|^2_{H^{1-s(t)}}.$$

Summing up, we have shown that up to an error which satisfies (4.24), the quantity (4.22) under consideration is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \mathrm{Re}\langle \widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} w_k, w_j \rangle + \gamma \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} 2\mathrm{Re}\langle \widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} w_k, w_j \rangle \\ &\qquad\qquad + \lambda \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} 2\mathrm{Re}\langle \widetilde{P}_{b_{j,k}} \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} w_k, \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} w_j \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

By (4.30), the last two sums are larger than or equal to $\delta_0 \delta_1 \|w(t)\|^2_{L^2}$ and $\delta_0 \delta_1 \|w(t)\|^2_{H^{0+\frac{1}{2}log}}$, respectively. Similarly, integrating the first term between 0 and t and using (4.30) gives control of $\frac{\delta_0 \delta_1}{2} \|w(t)\|_{L^2}$, finishing the proof of (4.23). □

4.4 A-priori estimates for the solutions of (4.11)

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is based on a-priori estimates for smooth solutions of the system (4.11).

Theorem 4.5. *There are* $\lambda_0 \geq 0$ *of the form* (2.30) *and* γ_0 *such that for* $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ *and* $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$ *the following is true:*

for all $u \in L^2([0,T];H^2)$ *and* $v \in L^2([0,T];H^1)$ *with* $\partial_t u \in L^2([0,T];H^1)$ *and* $\partial_t v \in L^1([0,T];L^2)$ *and for all parameters* λ, γ *and all* $t \leq T$, *the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{0\leq t'\leq t} e^{-2\gamma t'}\Big(\frac{1}{2}\delta_0\delta_1\|u(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t')}} + \|v(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')}}\Big)\\
&+ \delta_0\delta_1\int_0^t e^{-2\gamma t'}(\lambda\|u(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \gamma\|u(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t')}})dt'\\
&+ \int_0^t e^{-2\gamma t'}(\lambda\|v(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \gamma\|v(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')}})dt'\\
&\leq CA^2_{L^\infty}\|u(0)\|^2_{H^{1-\theta}} + \|v(0)\|^2_{H^{-\theta}} + 2\mathrm{Re}\int_0^t \langle f, Q^2_\gamma v\rangle\, dt'\\
&+ K\int_0^t e^{-2\gamma t'}\|g(t')\|_{1-s(t)-\frac{1}{2}log}\|u(t')\|_{1-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}dt',
\end{aligned}\tag{4.33}$$

with $f = Y^*v + \tilde{b}_0 v - \tilde{L}_2 u + \tilde{L}_1 u + \tilde{d}u \in L^1([0,T];H^{\alpha'-1})$, $g = Yu + \tilde{c}_0 u - v/a_0 \in L^2([0,T];H^{\alpha'})$ *for all* $\alpha' < \alpha$.

Proof. We compute the integral over $[0,t]$ of $\mathrm{Re}\langle f, Q^2_\gamma v\rangle$. Proposition 4.3 takes care of the first term $2\mathrm{Re}\langle Y^*v + \tilde{b}_0 v, Q^2_\gamma v\rangle$. We split the second term into three pieces

$$\langle \tilde{L}_2 u, Q^2_\gamma v\rangle = \langle \tilde{L}_2 u, Q^2_\gamma X u\rangle - \langle \tilde{L}_2 u, Q^2_\gamma(a_0 g)\rangle + \langle \tilde{L}_2 u, Q^2_\gamma(c_0 u)\rangle$$

and use Proposition 4.4 for the first piece. The multiplicative properties imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \tilde{L}_2 u(t), Q^2_\gamma(a_0 g)(t)\rangle| \leq& K\|g(t)\|_{1-s(t)-\frac{1}{2}log}\|\tilde{L}_2 u(t)\|_{-1-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}\\
\leq& K\|g(t)\|_{1-s(t)-\frac{1}{2}log}\|u(t)\|_{1-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \tilde{L}_2 u(t), Q^2_\gamma(c_0 u)(t)\rangle| \leq& K\|u(t)\|_{1-s(t)}\|\tilde{L}_2 u(t)\|_{-1-s(t)}\\
\leq& K\|u(t)\|^2_{1-s(t)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, using the multiplicative properties stated in Corollary 3.6 for the products $\widetilde{b}_j\partial_{x_j}u$ and $\partial_{x_j}(\tilde{c}_j u)$, and the embedding $L^2 \subset H^{-s}$ for the term $\tilde{d}u$, we see that

$$\|(\widetilde{L}_1 u + \tilde{d}u)(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)}} \le K\|u(t)\|_{H^{1-s(t)}}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle(\tilde{L}_1+\tilde{d})u(t), Q_\gamma^2 v(t)\rangle| \le& K\|u(t)\|_{1-s(t)}\|v(t)\|_{-s(t)} \\ \le& K\big(\|u(t)\|^2_{1-s(t)} + \|v(t)\|^2_{-s(t)}\big). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.4 gives an estimate of $\nabla_x u$. We also need an estimate for u. The identity (4.20) applied to u yields

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-2\gamma t}\|u(t)\|^2_{H^{-s(t)}} + \int_0^t e^{-2\gamma t'}(\lambda\|u(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \gamma\|u(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')}})dt' \\ = \|u_\gamma(0)\|^2_{H^{-s(0)}} + 2\mathrm{Re}\int_0^t \langle\partial_t u, Q_\gamma^2 u\rangle dt'. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we use the inequality

$$|\langle\partial_t u, Q_\gamma^2 u\rangle| \le C\big(\|u(t)\|^2_{H^{1-s(t)}} + \|\partial_t u(t)\|^2_{H^{-1-s(t)}}.\big)$$

In addition, we note that the second equation in (4.11) yields

$$\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-1-s(t)}} \le K\big(\|v(t)\|^2_{H^{-s(t)}} + \|u(t)\|^2_{H^{-s(t)}}\big) + \|g(t)\|^2_{H^{-1-s(t)}}.$$

We add the various estimates and use Propositions 4.3 and 4.4 to obtain a final estimate. On the left hand side we have

$$\sup_{0\le t'\le t} e^{-2\gamma t'}\Big(\frac{1}{2}\delta_0\delta_1\|u(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t')}} + \|v(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')}}\Big) \tag{4.34}$$

$$+\gamma\int_0^t e^{-2\gamma t'}\big(\delta_0\delta_1\|u(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t')}} + \|v(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')}}\big)dt' \tag{4.35}$$

$$+\lambda\int_0^t e^{-2\gamma t'}\big(\delta_0\delta_1\|u(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \|v(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}}\big)dt'. \tag{4.36}$$

On the right hand side, we find the initial data

$$CA^2_{L^\infty}\|u(0)\|^2_{H^{1-s(0)}} + \|v(0)\|^2_{H^{-s(0)}}, \tag{4.37}$$

the contribution of f

$$2\mathrm{Re}\int_0^t \langle f(t'), Q_\gamma v(t')\rangle dt', \tag{4.38}$$

an estimated contribution of g

$$K\int_0^t e^{-2\gamma t'}\|g(t')\|_{1-s(t)-\frac{1}{2}log}\|u(t')\|_{1-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}dt', \tag{4.39}$$

and two types of "remainders":

$$K_0 A_{LL} A_{L^\infty}\int_0^t e^{-2\gamma t'}\big(\|u(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}}+\frac{1}{\delta_0^2}\|v_\gamma(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}}\big)dt' \tag{4.40}$$

and

$$K\int_0^t e^{-2\gamma t'}\big(\|u_\gamma(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t')}}+\|v(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')}}\big)dt'. \tag{4.41}$$

If

$$\lambda \geq 2K_0\frac{A_{LL}A_{L^\infty}}{\delta_0\delta_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda \geq 2K_0\frac{A_{LL}A_{L^\infty}}{\delta_0^2} \tag{4.42}$$

the term in (4.40) can be absorbed by (4.36). Note that this choice of λ is precisely the choice announced in (2.30), with a new function K_0 of A_{L^∞}/δ_0. Finally, if γ is large enough, the term (4.41) is absorbed by (4.35), finishing the proof of the main estimate (4.33). □

4.5 Proof of Theorem 4.1

From now on, we assume that $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ and $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$ are fixed, so that the estimate (4.33) holds. Consider u, f, u_0 and u_1 satisfying the equation (4.3) and the smoothness assumptions (4.4), (4.5), (4.6). Consider $v = Xu + c_0 u$, which by Lemma 4.2 satisfies

$$v \in \mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log}, \quad \partial_t v \in L^1([0,T]; H^{-1-\theta_1}), \quad v_{|t=0} = v_0 \in H^{-\theta}, \tag{4.43}$$

with $v_0 = a_{0|t=0}u_1 + \sum a_{j|t=0}\partial_{x_j}u_0 + c_{0|t=0}u_0$. In particular, (u, v, f) and $g = 0$ satisfy (4.11).

We mollify u and v and introduce, for $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$u_\varepsilon = J_\varepsilon u, \quad v_\varepsilon = J_\varepsilon v \quad \text{with} \quad J\varepsilon = (1-\varepsilon\Delta_x)^{-1}. \tag{4.44}$$

For all $\varepsilon > 0$, (4.4) and (4.43) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} u_\varepsilon &\in L^2([0,T],H^2), \qquad & \partial_t u_\varepsilon &\in L^2([0,T],H^1),\\ v_\varepsilon &\in L^2([0,T],H^1), \qquad & \partial_t v_\varepsilon &\in L^1([0,T],L^2), \end{aligned}$$

(see (4.7)). Moreover, using the spatial Fourier transform, one immediately sees that u_ε converges to u in $\mathcal{H}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ and v_ε converges to v in $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} f_\varepsilon &= Y^* v_\varepsilon + \tilde{b}_0 v_\varepsilon - \tilde{L}_2 u_\varepsilon + \tilde{L}_1 u_\varepsilon + \tilde{d} u_\varepsilon,\\ g_\varepsilon &= Y u_\varepsilon + \tilde{c}_0 u_\varepsilon - v_\varepsilon / a_0. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.6. *Assumptions* (4.4) *and* (4.6) *imply that* $f_\varepsilon = f_{1,\varepsilon} + f_{2,\varepsilon}$ *with* $f_{1,\varepsilon} \to f_1$ *in* $\mathcal{L}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ *and* $f_{2,\varepsilon} \to f_2$ *in* $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta-\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$. *Moreover,* $g_\varepsilon \to 0$ *in* $\mathcal{H}_{1-\theta-\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$.

Taking this lemma for granted, we finish the proof of Theorem 4.1. We use the estimate (4.33) for $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$, together with the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f_\varepsilon(t), Q_\gamma^2 v(t)\rangle| \leq C e^{-2\gamma t}\big(&\|f_{1,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)}} \|v_\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)}}\\ &+ \|f_{2,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)-\frac{1}{2}log}} \|v_\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^{-s(t)+\frac{1}{2}log}}\big) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Big|\int_0^t \langle f_\varepsilon, Q_\gamma^2 v\rangle dt'\Big| &\leq C\Big(\int_0^t e^{-\gamma t'}\big(\|f_{1,\varepsilon}(t')\|_{H^{-s(t')}} dt'\Big) \sup_{0\leq t'\leq t} e^{-\gamma t'} \|v_\varepsilon(t')\|_{H^{-s(t')}}\\ &+C\Big(e^{-2\gamma t'} \|f_{2,\varepsilon}(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')-\frac{1}{2}log}} dt'\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big(e^{-2\gamma t'} \|v_\varepsilon(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}}\big) dt'\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that there is a K such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0\leq t'\leq t} \|u_\varepsilon(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t')}} + \sup_{0\leq t'\leq t} \|v_\varepsilon(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')}}\\ &+ \int_0^t \Big(\|u_\varepsilon(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \|v_\varepsilon(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}}\Big) dt' \end{aligned}$$

(4.45)

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq K\Big\{\|u_\varepsilon(0)\|^2_{H^{1-s(0)}} + \|v_\varepsilon(0)\|^2_{H^{-s(0)}} + \int_0^t \|g_\varepsilon(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t)-\frac{1}{2}log}} dt'\\ &\qquad + \Big(\int_0^t \|f_{1,\varepsilon}(t')\|_{H^{-s(t')}} dt'\Big)^2 + \int_0^t \|f_{2,\varepsilon}(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')-\frac{1}{2}log}} dt'\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, there are similar estimates for the differences $(u_\varepsilon - u_{\varepsilon'}, v_\varepsilon - v_{\varepsilon'})$. Since $u_\varepsilon(0) = J_\varepsilon u_0$ and $v_\varepsilon(0) = J_\varepsilon v_0$ converge to u_0 and v_0 in $H^{1-s(0)}$ and $H^{-s(0)}$, respectively, the estimate implies that u_ε is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{H}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ and in $C^0([0,t]; H^{1-s(t)})$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. Therefore, the limit u in $\mathcal{H}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ also belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T)$. Similarly, v_ε is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ and in $C^0([0,t]; H^{-s(t)})$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and $v \in \mathcal{C}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T)$. In addition, we can pass to the limit in (4.45) proving that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0\le t'\le t} \|u(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t')}} + \sup_{0\le t'\le t} \|v(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')}} \\ &+ \int_0^t \Big(\|u(t')\|^2_{H^{1-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}} + \|v(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')+\frac{1}{2}log}} \Big) dt' \\ &\le K \Big\{ \|u_0\|^2_{H^{1-s(0)}} + \|v_0\|^2_{H^{-s(0)}} \\ &\qquad + \Big(\int_0^t \|f_1(t')\|_{H^{-s(t')}} dt' \Big)^2 + \int_0^t \|f_2(t')\|^2_{H^{-s(t')-\frac{1}{2}log}} dt' \Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.46}$$

Using the equation $Yu + \tilde{c}_0 u = v/a_0$ and the estimate (4.13) of Lemma 4.2 to bound the time derivative $\partial_t u$, we see that $\partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ and that the energy estimate (2.29) is satisfied.

Therefore, it remains only to prove the lemma.

Proof of Lemma 4.6. By assumption (4.6), $f = f_1 + f_2$ and $J_\varepsilon f_1 \to f_1$ in $\mathcal{L}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ and $J_\varepsilon f_2 \to f_2$ in $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta-\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}(T)$. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that the commutators

$$\begin{aligned} &[Y^*, J_\varepsilon]v, \quad [\tilde{L}_2, J_\varepsilon]u \\ &[\tilde{b}_0, J_\varepsilon]v, \quad [\tilde{L}_1, J_\varepsilon]u, \quad [\tilde{d}, J_\varepsilon]u, \end{aligned}$$

converge to 0 in $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ and that the commutators

$$[Y, J_\varepsilon]u, \quad [\tilde{c}_0, J_\varepsilon]u, \quad [1/a_0, J_\varepsilon]v$$

converge to 0 in $\mathcal{H}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T)$. We note that J_ε commutes with ∂_t in Y^* and Y. Thanks to (4.4) (4.43) and to the conservative form of Y^* and $\tilde{L}*_2$, we see that there are four types of commutators to consider :

$$\begin{aligned} &[a, J_\varepsilon]w \to 0 \ \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T), \quad \text{when} \\ &a \in L^\infty \cap LL([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d), \quad w \in \mathcal{H}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T), \end{aligned} \tag{4.47}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[b, J_\varepsilon] w \to 0 \ \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T), \quad \text{when} \\
&b \in C^\alpha([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d), \quad w \in \mathcal{H}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T),
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.48}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[c, J_\varepsilon] w \to 0 \ \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T), \quad \text{when} \\
&c \in C^\alpha([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d), \quad w \in \mathcal{H}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T),
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.49}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[d, J_\varepsilon] w \to 0 \ \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T), \quad \text{when} \\
&d \in L^\infty([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d), \quad w \in \mathcal{H}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T).
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.50}
$$

The first commutators $[a, J_\varepsilon] = [T_a, J_\varepsilon] + R_a, J_\varepsilon - J_\varepsilon R_a$ are uniformly bounded from $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ to $\mathcal{H}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T)$: this is true for the first term by Proposition 3.7, since the J_ε form a bounded family of operators of degree 0; for the last two terms, this follows from Proposition 3.4. Moreover, $[a, J_\varepsilon]w \to 0$ in $L^2([0,T]; H^\sigma)$ for all $\sigma < 1$, and thus also in $\mathcal{H}_{1-\theta,\lambda}$, when w is smooth and $a \in L\infty \cap LL$. By density, this implies (4.47).

For the commutators (4.48), we note that they are uniformly bounded from $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ to $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$. This is true for both terms bJ_ε and $J_\varepsilon b$ since $s(t)$ remains in a compact subset of $[0, \alpha[$. Because $[b, J_\varepsilon]w$ converges to zero in $L^2([0,T]; H^\sigma)$ for all $\sigma < \alpha$, when w is smooth and $b \in L\infty \cap LL$, the convergence in (4.48) follows. The proof for (4.49) is similar.

Finally, we note that $[d, J_\varepsilon]w \to 0$ in $L^2([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$, hence in $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ when $d \in L^\infty([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $w \in L^2([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$, thus in particular when $w \in \mathcal{H}_{1-\theta,\lambda}(T)$. $\square$

4.6 Existence and uniqueness

Proof of Theorem 2.4.

Assume that $u \in H^s(]0,T[\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $s \in]1-\alpha, \alpha[$, $T \le T_0$, and satisfies

$$
Lu = 0, \quad u_{|t=0} = 0, \quad Xu_{|t=0} = 0. \tag{4.51}
$$

We want to prove that $u = 0$.

Fix $\theta < \theta_1$ in $]1-\alpha, \alpha[$ with $1-\theta < s$. Let λ and T' be the parameter and time associated to them by Theorem 4.1. Note that they depend only on θ, θ_1, the norms A_{L^∞} and A_{LL} in (2.9) and the constants of hyperbolicity δ_0 and δ_1 in (2.8).

From Lemma 2.2, we know that $u \in L^2([0,T]; H^s(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and $\partial_t u \in L^2([0,T]; H^{s-1}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and therefore, on $[0,T']\times\mathbb{R}^n$, $u \in \mathcal{H}_{1-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}$ and $\partial_t u \in \mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}$ since $s > 1-\theta-\lambda t$. By Theorem 4.1, u satisfies the energy estimate (2.29) on $[0,T']$, and since the right hand side vanishes, $u = 0$ for $t < T'$. By a finite number of iterations, u vanishes for $t < T$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.6.

On $[0, T_0] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the coeffficients of L_2 can be approximated in L^∞ and $C^{\alpha'}$ for all $\alpha' < 1$ by C^∞ functions which are uniformly bounded in L^∞ and in LL, in such a way that the hyperbolicity condition (2.8) remains satisfied. Similarly, the coeffficients of L_1 can be approximated in L^∞ and $C^{\alpha'}$ for all $\alpha' < \alpha$ by smooth functions which are uniformly bounded in C^α. Further, the coefficient c can be approximated in L^2_{loc} by functions uniformly bounded in L^∞. This defines operators L^ε with C^∞ coefficients which satisfy (2.8), (2.9) and (2.10) uniformly in ε and converge to the coefficients of L in the sense described above.

We fix the parameter $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, where λ_0 is given by Theorem 4.1. Recall that T is then given by (4.2). Consider Cauchy data $u_0 \in H^{1-\theta}$ and $u_1 \in H^{-\theta}$ and a source term $f = f_1 + f_2$ with $f_1 \in \mathcal{L}_{-\theta,\lambda}(T)$ and $f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_{-\theta-\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}$. We can approximate these data in the corresponding spaces by C^∞ functions u_0^ε, u_1^ε , f_1^ε and f_2^ε, compactly supported in x. The strictly hyperbolic problems with smooth coefficients and smooth data

$$L^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = f_1^\varepsilon + f_2^\varepsilon, \quad u^\varepsilon{}_{|t=0} = u_0^\varepsilon, \quad X^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon{}_{|t=0} = u_1^\varepsilon \tag{4.52}$$

have a unique smooth solution u^ε, compactly supported in x.

By Theorem 4.1, the energy estimate (2.29) is satisfied with a constant K independent of ε. Therefore the family $\{u^\varepsilon\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{H}_{1-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}$, thus in $L^2([0,T], H^{1-\theta_1})$ and the families $\{\partial_t u^\varepsilon\}$ and $\{X^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon\}$ are bounded in $\mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}$, hence in $L^2([0,T], H^{-\theta_1})$. Therefore, extracting a subsequence if necessary, u^ε converges to a limit u, weakly in $L^2([0,T], H^{1-\theta_1})$ and in $H^1([0,T], H^{-\theta_1})$. Moreover, $u \in \mathcal{H}_{1-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}$ and $\partial_t u \in \mathcal{H}_{-\theta+\frac{1}{2}log,\lambda}$. There is no difficulty in passing to the limit in the equation in the sense of distributions: all the products are well defined and involve one strong and one weak convergence. Thus $Lu = f$.

The weak convergence in $L^2([0,T], H^{1-\theta_1}) \cap H^1([0,T], H^{-\theta_1})$ implies the strong convergence in $C^0([0,T]; H^{-\theta_1}_{loc})$ and therefore the convergence of $u^\varepsilon_{|t=0}$ to $u_{|t=0}$ in $H^{-\theta_1}_{loc}$. Therefore, $u_{|t=0} = u_0$.

Using the equation as in Lemma 2.2, we prove that the family $v^\varepsilon = X^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon + c_0^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon$, which converges weakly to $v = Xu + c_0 u$, is bounded in $L^2([0,T], H^{-\theta_1}) \cap H^1([0,T], H^{-1-\theta_1})$. Thus $v^\varepsilon_{|t=0}$ converges to $v_{|t=0}$ in $H^{-\theta_1}_{loc}$. Hence $v_{|t=0} = u_1 + c_{0|t=0} u_0$ implying that $Xu_{|t=0} = u_1$.

By Theorem 4.1 the solution u also belong to $\mathcal{C}_{1-\theta,\lambda}$ with $\partial_t u \in \mathcal{C}_{1-\theta,\lambda}$ and satisfies the energy estimate (2.29). $\square$

5 Local results

We consider the equation (1.1) together with an initial hypersurface Σ satisfying Assumption 1.1. Everything being local, and the assumptions being invariant under smooth changes of coordinates, we may assume that we are working in coordinates $y = (t, x)$ such that $\underline{y} = (0, 0)$ and $\Sigma = \{t = 0\}$. The operator has the form (2.1) with coefficients which are defined on a neigborhood Ω of the origin.

Lemma 1.2 is a local version of Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2. The proof is identical, using local multiplicative properties and local versions of the spaces $H^{s,s'}$.

5.1 Local existence

Choose Φ, a smooth map from $\mathbb{R}^{1+n}$ to Ω, with $\Phi(y) = y$ on a smaller neighborhood Ω_1 and $\Phi(y) = 0$ for y large enough. Changing the coefficients acoording to the rule $a^\sharp(y) = a(\Phi(y))$ we obtain an operator $L^\sharp$ which coincides with L on Ω_1, satisfies the regularity conditions (2.4) to (2.6), and the hyperbolicity conditions (2.8) globally on $\mathbb{R}^{1+n}$.

Fix $s > 1 - \alpha$. Without loss of generality for the statememt of Theorem 1.3, we can assume that $s < \alpha$. We are going to apply Theorem 2.6 to the operator $L^\sharp$ with $\theta = 1 - s \in]1 - \alpha, \alpha[$. Choosing $\theta_1 \in]\theta, \alpha[$, this theorem provides us with λ and $T = (\theta_1 - \theta)/\lambda$. We fix $\Omega' = \Omega_1 \cap \{|t| < T\}$.

Suppose that u_0 and u_1 are Cauchy data in $H^s(\omega)$ and $H^{s-1}(\omega)$ respectively, on a neighborhood ω of 0 in $\mathbb{R}^n$. There are restrictions to ω of functions $u_0^\sharp \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $u_1^\sharp \in H^{s-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ respectively. Suppose that $f \in L^2(\Omega' \cap \{t > 0\})$. We extend it, for instance by 0, to $f^\sharp \in L^2([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. By Theorem 2.6, the Cauchy problem

$$L^\sharp u^\sharp = f^\sharp, \quad u^\sharp_{|t=0} = u_0^\sharp, \quad (X^\sharp u^\sharp)_{|t=0} = u_1^\sharp \tag{5.1}$$

has a solution $u^\sharp$ on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, which belongs in particular to $L^2([0, T]; H^{s_1})$ with $s_1 = 1 - \theta_1$ and such that $\partial_t u \in L^2([0, T]; H^{s_1 - 1})$. In particular, $u^\sharp \in H^{s_1}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ and by restriction to Ω' defines a solution of (1.6).

5.2 Local uniqueness

To prove Theorem 1.4, we first reduce the problem to proving a theorem of propagation of zero accross the surface $\{t = 0\}$.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that* $s > 1 - \alpha$ *and* $u \in H^s(\Omega \cap \{t > 0\})$ *satisfies*

$$Lu = 0, \quad u_{|t=0} = 0, \quad Xu_{|t=0} = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

Then the extension u_e *of* u *by* 0 *for* $t < 0$ *satisfies*

$$u_e \in H^s \quad \text{and} \quad Lu_e = 0 \tag{5.3}$$

on a neighborhood Ω_1 *of* 0.

Proof. If the coefficients were smooth, this would be immediate. We check that we have enough smoothness to extend the result to our case.

We can assume that $\Omega =]-T, T[\times\omega$. From Lemma 2.2 (localized in space) we know that $u \in L^2([0,T]; H^s_{loc}(\omega))$, thus its extension $u_e \in L^2([-T,T]; H^s_{loc}(\omega))$. Moreover, $\partial_t u \in L^2([0,T]; H^{s-1}_{loc}(\omega))$ and by assumption $u_{|t=0} = 0$. Therefore, $\partial_t u_e$ is the extension of $\partial_t u$ by 0 and thus belongs to $L^2([-T,T]; H^{s-1}_{loc}(\omega))$. In particular, $u_e \in H^s_{loc}(]-T,T[\times\omega)$.

Let $v = Xu + c_0 u \in L^2([0,T]; H^{s-1}_{loc}(\omega))$ and let $v_e \in L^2([-T,T]; H^{s-1}_{loc}(\omega))$ denote its extension by 0. The first step implies that Xu_e is the extension of Xu and therefore $v_e = Xu_e + c_0 u_e$. Write the equation as

$$\partial_t v = P(u, v) \tag{5.4}$$

where P involves only spatial derivatives (see (2.17)). Morever, we have seen in the proof of Lemma 2.2 that $P(u,v) \in L^2([0,T]; H^{s-2}_{loc}(\omega))$. Since by assumption the trace of v vanishes, this implies that $\partial_t v_e$ is the extension by 0 of $\partial_t v$, thus the extension of $P(u,v)$, that is $P(u_e, v_e)$. Since $v_e = Xu_e + c_0 u_e$, this means that u_e satisfies the equation on $\Omega =]-T,T[\times\omega$. ☐

We now finish the proof of Theorem 1.4. We suppose that $u \in H^s(\Omega \cap \{t > 0\})$ satisfies (5.2), with $s > 1 - \alpha$ and we denote by u_e its extension by 0 for $t < 0$. We use the classical convexification method, and consider the change of variables

$$(t, x) \mapsto (\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) \quad \tilde{t} = t + |x|^2, \ \tilde{x} = x, \tag{5.5}$$

which maps the past $\{t < 0\}$ to $\{\tilde{t} < |\tilde{x}|^2\}$. Thus there is $T_0 > 0$ such that the function $\tilde{u}$ deduced from u_e is defined for $\tilde{t} < T_0$ and vanishes for $\tilde{t} < |\tilde{x}|^2$. Moreover, decreasing T_0 if necessary, the operator $\tilde{L}$ deduced from L is defined on a neighborhood $\tilde{\Omega}$ of the origin which contains the closed lens $\overline{D} = \{|\tilde{x}|^2 \leq t \leq T_0\}$ and $\tilde{L}\tilde{u} = 0$ on $\tilde{\Omega} \cap \{t < T_0\}$. Now we extend the coefficients of $\tilde{L}$, as above, and obtain a new operator $L^\sharp$, defined on $\mathbb{R}^{1+n}$, satisfying the assumptions of section 2, and equal to $\tilde{L}$ on a neighborhood of $\overline{D}$. Therefore, on $]-\infty, T_0[\times\mathbb{R}^n$

$$L^\sharp \tilde{u} = 0, \quad \tilde{u} \in H^s, \quad \tilde{u}_{|\{\tilde{t}<|\tilde{x}|^2\}} = 0. \tag{5.6}$$

Since $\tilde{u}$ vanishes in the past, the traces $\tilde{u}_{|t=-\varepsilon}$ and $X^\sharp \tilde{u}_{|t=-\varepsilon}$ vanish for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Therefore, Theorem 2.4 applied to the Cauchy problem for $L^\sharp$ with initial time $-\varepsilon$ implies that $\tilde{u} = 0$ for all $(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x})$ such that $\tilde{t} < T_0$. Hence $u = 0$ on a neighborhood of the origin.

References

[1] J.-M. Bony, *Calcul symbolique et propagation des singularités pour les équations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **14** (1981), 209-246.

[2] M. Cicognani and F. Colombini, *Modulus of Continuity of the Coefficients and Loss of Derivatives in the Strictly Hyperbolic Cauchy Problems*, J. Diff. Equat. **221** (2006), 143-157.

[3] R.Coifman and Y.Meyer, *Au delà des opérateurs pseudo-différentiels.* Astérisque, **57**. Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 1978.

[4] F. Colombini, E. De Giorgi and S. Spagnolo, *Sur les équations hyperboliques avec des coefficients qui ne dépendent que du temps*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. **6** (1979), 511-559.

[5] F. Colombini and N. Lerner, *Hyperbolic operators with non-Lipschitz coefficients*, Duke Math. J. **77** (1995), 657-698.

[6] L.Hörmander, *Linear partial differential operators.* Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Bd. **116**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg, 1963.

[7] E.Jannelli, *Regularly hyperbolic systems and Gevrey classes.* Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **140** (1985), 133-145.

[8] G.Métivier, *Interaction de deux chocs pour un système de deux lois de conservation en dimension deux d'espace.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **296** (1986), 431-479.

[9] G.Métivier, *Small Viscosity and Boundary Layer Methods. Theory, stability analysis, and applications.* Modelling and Simulation in Science, Engineering and Technology, Birkhäuser Boston, 2004.

[10] G.Métivier and K.Zumbrun, *Large viscous boundary layers for noncharacteristic nonlinear hyperbolic problems*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **175** (2005).

[11] Y.Meyer, *Remarques sur un théorème de J.-M. Bony*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo **2** (1981), suppl. 1, 1-20.

[12] T.Nishitani *Sur les équations hyperboliques à coefficients höldériens en t et de classe de Gevrey en x*, Bull. Sci. Math. (2) **107** (1983), 113-138.